

*Canis*  
**Diaphanta;**

*f* A N W O R, *Benechi*

Three Attendants on

*f. Rob. Killmbeck.*  
**FIAT LUX.**

Wherin Catholik Religion is further excused against the opposition of severall Adversaries.

- 1 *Epistola ad Odoenum*, against Dr. Owen.
- 2 *Epistola ad Croesum*, against Mr. Whitby.
- 3 *Epistola ad Ampibolum*, against Dr. Taylor.

And by the way an Answer is given to Mr. Moulin, Denton, and Stillingfleet.

---

*Quare fremuerunt gentes, & populi meditati sunt inania.*

---



The occasion of this first Epistle.

**T**He Authour had wrote a little book called *Fiat Lux*, to show that wrangling about Religion is irrational. A Protestant, understood afterward to be Dr. Owen, set forth *Animadversions* against that book. And this Epistle acquaints the Doctour with some of the ill qualities of those his *Animadversions*.

## I.

*An Epistle to the Author of the Animadversions upon Fiat Lux.*

SIR,

**I** Was in my Journey in the North, far enough from London, when your *Animadversions upon Fiat Lux* came forth. Nor did I ever set eye upon them, till my return in February, about half a year after: which I tell you Sir, to excuse my silence. And now in brief: For your labour I thank you; for your endeavour I pity you; for your purpose I pardon you: that being as I beleve, intended for Gentlemens satisfaction, the other for *Fiat Lux* his confutation, this for the Authors confusion.

I may not go about to reply unto you; because this would be against the very end and principles of *Fiat Lux* it self, which speaks forth nothing more then this, *That Controversies about Religion are vain and fruitless.* And lest this should not be able to detain me from any such reply, you adde your own threats, That if I

shall dare to write again, you will make me know what manner of man you are. However Sir, let we crave leave to thank you for the pastime your *Animadversious* have given me since my return.

But Sir, you mistake the very drift and design of *Fiat Lux*, which makes you to erre ever and anon, throughout your whole Book, whiles you take that as spoken absolutely which is only said upon an *hypothesis* of our present condition here in *England*, distraction, disputes, and wars, in order to a contrary end of unity, love, and concord, designed by *Fiat Lux*; and the *Prosopeia*'s brought in by me, as *Solomon* in his *Ecclesiastes* makes the fool and atheist ever and anon to speak their minds, these you conceive to be my doctrine. By vertue of these capital mistakes, what by me is said of the obscurity of God, Nature, and Providence, is with you impertinent; that of Light and Spirit, impious; that of Plea of Parties, frivolous; that of Reason, dissonant and to no purpos; that of Scripture blasphemous; that of the History of Religion, no less inconsequent than untrue. In a word, this thing, that thing, every thing, a wilde, dishonest illiterate discours.

Some would wonder, that he who writes in confutation of a Book, should be himself the only man that understands it not. But the reason is apparent: It is your onely advantage to  
mistake.

mistake. The whole discours of *Fiat Lux* chain-  
ed together, one part with another, from that  
which is supposed to that which is designed,  
would breath so much of charity and sobernes,  
that my *Commentatour* could not have told how  
to make any *mad versions* upon it. It is not  
yet too late. Now that you have finished your  
*Animadversions*, or Comment, or Notes upon it,  
you may do well to take my Book again into  
your hands; read it calmly, and understand it.

That which you speak so frequently of *Fiat Lux* his ignorance, is not altogether amiss: for  
he pretends not much to learning, although he  
knows what he sayes. But yet Sir, if you had  
desied and villified him with less violence, and  
more seldom, and not so universally in every  
point of history, language, and philosophy, nor  
just then when you had least caus, it had been  
more for your honour. A third part of your  
Book, which is taken up in talking of my igno-  
rance and other qualities, might well have been  
spared, had you had arguments to demonstrate  
it.

And in my minde you too much forget your  
self, when you recount so often with regret and  
anger, that som gentlemen of the land should  
through their own inconsideration, have any  
liking of a Book which you judg so slight, aiery,  
vain, fallacious, and simple. As if they had  
none, and you all the judgment of discerning.

Gentlemen, Sir, must be allowed a sens of Religion as well as Ministers; and their portion of reason must not therfor be less, becaus their Blood is more noble, the company they keep more accomplisht, and their education better. They have the body, although they wear not the Cloak of Religion, and masters they are of their own reason, tho not of yours. This is one difference between Catholik countreys and ours; that there the Clergy-man is only regarded for his vertue & the power he hath received, or is at least believed to have received from God in the great ministry of our reconciliation. And if he have any addition of learning besides, it is looked upon as a good accidental ornament, but not as any essential complement of his Profession. So that it often happens, without any wonderment at all, that the Gentleman Patron is the learned man, and the Priest his Chaplain of little or no science in comparison. But here in *England* our Gentlemen are disparaged by their own Black Coats; and not suffered to use their judgments in any kinde of learning, without a gybe from them. The Gentleman is reasonles, and the scribbling Cassock is the only Schollar: he alone must speak all, know all, and only understand.

I cannot but smile to see you turn so dexterously every thing that is said in *Fiat Lux*, to your own use. His discours of innocence and mode-

moderation, gives you occasion to speak, and amply dilate of wars, murders, adulteries, lyes, hypocrisies, villanies: And when he cries, *Peace, Peace*, it is motive enough for you to cry, *Guns and Daggers*. You rave and rage against him and the whole earth; you load your pen and pages with the tyrannies, desolations, disorders have been aforetime in the world, not heeding that you had not so much as heard at this day of any such abuses, if their holy and renowned Clergy-men, who still declaimed against the vices of their times, had not left them upon record; or so much as considering, that even now in these best times of Reformation are as grand disorders in all kindes as ever were in the worst times of Popish corruption.

Nay there was never any crow or magpie so pecked and cawed upon the back of a sheep, as you do upon *Fiat Lux*; and if he do but stir or wag, you threaten, if I understand you right, to peck out his eyes. And all this, because *Fiat Lux* endeavours to show, that animosities about matters of Religion are groundless, prejudicial to peace and neighbourhood, ruinous, desolatory, endles, and consequently vain, fruitles, and sinful; (ther may indeed be som advantage on the Defendants side, which is not in the Plaintiff or Actour, but this at present I am not to take notice of) nay finally, that they have ever don much harm in Kingdoms, but never good.



In all this Sir, you do like your self; you love nois and whirlwinds, and when you hear of *Peace*, prepare your self to *Battle*; so ill do you understand the sound of a retreat; or, becaus it suits not with your ends and inclinations, will not.

But all this discours of *Fiat Lux*, tends, say you, to *Popery*. A fearful thing, and ungrateful news to Ministers; for whose foolish, endles, and ungrounded quarrels, we have lately engaged our honour, peace, livelihood, lives, and all that is dear unto us; and yet we are still, but where we were before we began. Nay, we are ten times farther off from any reconcilment, unity, or satisfaction then before. And such success have all wars ever had, where the alarm was given in the Pulpit. But why must it tend to *Popery*? Becaus that *Fiat Lux* is bold to say, that *Popery* in its own likenes is not so ugly as we imagin it. Lord! what a strange thing is this, that either *Fiat Lux* or any els should presume to say, that we in *England*, or other Nations may be carried by the reports of som interested men, to think wors of a thing then it may deserv; especially considering that we com all to Church to hear Gods Words, and there meet with a man, who in the first opening of his lips, cryes, *Hearken my Beloved to the word of the Lord*; and so having with that airy honey-comb sweetned the edges of our ears, pours into them

them afterward what poison of his own conceived interests he pleases; all which we his *dearly beloved* let down greedily into our hearts, as that precious word of the Lord which he at first proclaimed. By which fallacies, we have been in the time of these our late wars, so far inveigled, (I speak to men now alive, who all know I speak true) that it became then a most dangerous thing, yea, treason it self, to say, *God save the King*, who was by this our Pulpit rhetoric made as odious then throughout the land, as Popery, what ever it be, ever was or can be. And are not neighbours thus abused daily almost in every thing? Where is that man, who hath not by such like means been one time or other induced to think amiss, even of his most innocent and dearest friends, till himself by trial found the contrary? *O but God forbid*, you will say, *that ever we should come by trial to know what Popery is*. Sir, may it be far from us, so long as heaven pleases. But i'th interim, what harm can it be to us to mitigate our passions? which if there be no mistake, are prejudicial notwithstanding to our own peace; and if a mistake there should be, are double injurious, and desperately sinful before God and man. *Oh but mistake there can be none!* Sir, let me tell you roundly. By your own Book of *Animadversions* I do as clearly see, as ever I beheld Sun in the Firmament, that you do not your self understand what

Pope-

Popery is ; even no more, then the poorest meanest peasant in the Parish. But who is able to make this good and clear unto you? no body Sir, so long as you are in passion, in a calm of indifferency your very self. Nor could I without that serenity, have been ever able to discern it. But yet, there is one thing more, which will hinder your acknowledgement, although you should come to know it. It is their interest to justify themselves, and yours to condemn them.

Had not you with your threats so much frightened me from any thought of writing any more, I could I think my self, who am in your judgement one of the greatest ingrats in the Land, make it yet appear, that the present Popish Religion, if to please you they will give me leave to call it so, is not only less ugly then we conceive it, but far more innocent and amiable then I have made it. And, if there were not so much as one Catholik, or Romanist, or Papist upon earth, yet so far am I from any interest herein, that in that judgment I would notwithstanding dy alone. Nor had I set before my eyes any other end in that my *Fiat* of moderation, against which you write your hot *Animadversions*, then the peace and wellar of my Countrey, which under the pretended shadow of Popery, inflamed by the alarms of *Vicars* and their *Wives*, for whom we fight as it were *pro aris & focis*, hates and mischiefs, strikes and destroys one another with-

without end. And yet, which is a strange thing, whilst every one conceits himself to fight for *Purity* of Gospel against *Popery*, they fight all for *Popery* against *Purity* of Gospel. And this you must affirm your self, if you do but remember what in your Book of *Animadversions* you so frequently assert; that what good soever the *Papists* or Roman Catholiks either do or have amongst them, they have and do the same as *Christians* and not as *Papists*; and that *Popery* is it self nothing els, but pride, interest ambition, tyranny, worldly respects, thirst of blood, affectation of dominion, &c. As I am sure on the other side, that grace, charity, and peace is the pure quintessence of Gospel, and the very extract of true Religion. Either then I had reason to tell you, that you understand not what *Popery* is; or if you do, you must needs acknowledge, that those who here in *England*, betwixt the years of 1640. and 1660. with guns and daggers, as you often phrase it, with field rhetoric and pulpit cannon, subverted all before them, even Church and State too, let them call themselves *Puritans*, *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, or what they pleas, were all of them by this your own rule, as *arch. Papis* as ever trode upon the earth. Nor is it of concernment, so they have the reality of the thing, whence they may borrow their name; whether some man upon earth be their *Pope*, or whether the *Devil* be

be himself their ghostly father.

And I fear Sir, you wer your self some part of that dismal tempest; which in the last years of our woful *Anarchy* overbore all before it, not only Church and State, but reason, right, honesty, all true Religion, and even good natur too. The very flashings of your pen move me to this thought. The whole physiognomy of your Book speaks the hot and fiery spirit of the Authour. First, you cannot abide to hear of *moderation*, it is with you most wicked, hypocritical, and devillish, especially as it comes from me. And for this one thing *Fiat Lux* suffers more from you, then for all the contents of the Book put together. My reason is your passion; my moderation inflames your wrath; and you are therfor stark wild, becaus I utter so much of sobriety. Secondly, your so frequent talking of *sword and blood, fire and faggot, guns and daggers*, do more then show, you have not yet let go those hot and furious imaginations. It is a phrase so ordinary with you, that when another writer of your own judgment would have told me, that my words are false or besides the purpos, or the like, you in a phrase of your own tell me still that I speak guns and daggers. If he mean, say you of me, p 27. *that ther is in good works an intrinsecal worth, &c.* he speaks daggers, and doth not himself beleev what he sayes. And again, p. 94. *For men to come now in the end of the world,*

world, and tell us, That we must rest in the authority of the present Church, &c. is to speak daggers and swords to us, upon a confidence that we will suffer our selves to be befoold. So likewise p. 340. He tells us, say you of me, it is good to prefer a Translation before the Originals. What shall we do with those men that speak such swords and daggers, and are well neither full nor fasting. I pray Sir where did you borrow this trope? had you it from the school of Aristotle, or Mars his camp?

Thirdly, your prophetick assurance so often inculcated, that if you could but once come to whisper me in the ear, I would plainly acknowledg, either that I understand not my self what I say, or if I do, beleeve it not, gives a fair character of those fanatick times, wherein ignorance and hypocrisy prevailed over worth and truth; wherof if your self wer any part, it is no wonder you should think that I or any man els, should either speak he knows not what, or beleeve not, what himself speaks. It was the proper badg of those times, when after the alarm sounded in the Pulpit, that our people therupon went forth in troops to battle, neither did the peasant understand, nor the man in black beleeve, although the sound rung generally in their ears, that it was the sword of the Lord and of Gideon, which they brandisht against the loyal band, their foes. Measuring me it seems by your self, you tell me no less than seven times in your book, that



I beleeve not, and I think seaventy times, that I understand not what I speak my self. It is a kind of charity in you to think your neighbour is as you know your self to be. But I do not much care for that charity, except you were better than I find you are.

Fourthly, your pert assertion so often occurring in your book, that *ther is neither reason, truth, nor honesty in my words*, is but the overflowing of that former intemperat zeal: and the more frequent it occurs, the less approbation it will find. Fifthly, your sharp and frequent menaces, that if I write or speak again, I shall hear more, find more, feel more, more to my smart, more than I imagin, more than I would, relishes too much of that insulting humour our bleeding Land then groaned under, the many years of our anarchical confusion. Sixthly, the absence of your *name* in the frontispiece of your book, which I have never before observed in all my life of any Protestant writer, that hath ever in my time set forth a book here in *England* against Popery, gives no small suspicion that the Authour of our *Animadversione* is no such *Protestant* as he would be thought to be. Lastly, that I may omit other special reasons, your other general trick of charging me then most of all with *fraud, ignorance, and wickedness*, when in your own heart you find me most clear from any such blemish, thereby to put a vail upon your own caus, which  
would

would otherways be disparaged, makes me smell a fox, a notorious one. *Sic notus Ulysses*. This has been too often acted here in England to be soon forgotten. The better the caus, the lower still was the cry against those who stood for it; that the blustering nois of calumnies might drown all report of their innocence. And by all this I cannot Sir but suspect, that if the description of Popery your *Animadversions* gives us be right, you are a Papist your self, and no true Protestant, a notorious Papist. But as it is, so let it be.

Thus much I only tell you, that you may see I am neither neglective of your book, nor idle; but have perused and read it over. And although what for the threats of your *Animadversions*, and what for the reasons of my own *Fiat*, I may not enter into controversie: yet I hope I may let you know that I have seen your work. And that you may the better credit me, I will give you a short account of it, first in general, then in particular. And this is all I mean here to do.

The whole design of *Fiat Lux* you do utterly mistake, throughout all your book of *Animadversions*; so that you conceiv that to be a controversy, which is none; that to be absolutely asserted, which is but hypothetically discoursed out of the exceptions of other men; that to be only for one side, which is indifferently for all;

all; although I speak most for them that are most spoken against, and am in very deed absolutely against all speaking, quarrelling, disputing about Religion. If you will but have patience to hear my purpos and design, which to all men not interested and blinded with a prejudice, is clear enough relucant in the whole context of my *Fiat*, what I say will easily appear to your self. *Fiat Lux* sayes one thing, and supposes it; another thing he desires and aims at: that he dislikes; this he commends. We are at this day at variance about Religion, this *Fiat Lux* supposes. But it were better to have peace; this he aims at and desires. And both these things are intermingled up and down in my book, according to that small faculty that God hath given me, though not according to the usual method that is found now adayes in books. Here Sir in few words you have the summe of my *Fiat*. And I hope you will grant that to be the scope of my book, which I made it for. That we are now at variance is most clear and certain; by me supposed, and not to be denied. And that it were better to have peace, is as absolutely expedient, as the other is evidently true. These then being things both of them which no man can resist; either by denying the one, or disliking the other; I thought them better intermingled then set apart; and with more reason to be supposed, then industriously proved.

Yet

Yet to superinduce a disposition unto peace, my only work was to demonstrate an uselesnes, an endlesnes, an unprofitableness of quarrels, which I laboured quite through my book; beginning it with an intimation of our quarrels, which *St. Paul* calls the fruits and works of the flesh; and ending it with a commendation of charity, which is the great fruit and blessing of Gods holy Spirit. Now the easier to perswade my Countrey-men to a belief both of the one and the other, first is insinuated in *Fiat Lux*, both the ill grounds and worst effects of feuds; then is the plea of parties specified; their probabilities acknowledged; and lastly an impossibility of ever bringing our debates to a conclusion, either by light or spirit, reason or scriptur texts, so long as we stand separated from any superiour judicative power, unto which all parties will submit, is I think with a strong probability, if not demonstrative evidence concluded. And therfor is it thought by *Fiat Lux* to be more rational and Christian-like, to leav these endles, groundles, and ruinous contentions, and resign our selves to humility and peace. This is the design and whole summe of my book. And although I speak up and down, here for *Papists*, there for *Protestants*, elsewhere for *Presbyterians* or *Independants*, commonly out of the very discourses they make for themselves; yet do I not defend either their wayes, or their arguments.

Nor do I teach any doctrine at all, or hold there any opinion. But I only give to understand in that one little book, what is largely discoursed in a hundred, *That all parties do make out to themselves such a probability, which as it stands joyned with the actors resolution, and separated from any superiour visible power to which they will submit, can never be subdued.* And hath not long experience proved this as true as any thing els? What then is there in *Fiat Lux* that can be denied? Is it not evident that we are now at variance? and too long indeed have been. Is it not also clear, that peace, charity, and neighbourhood is better then variance, dissention, and wars? Do not parties strongly plead for themselves, so far perswaded each one that himself is in the right, that he will not yield, the truth to be with any but himself. Is not all this evident? I am sure it is; and all England will witness it.

And if any one should be able to evince, that any reasonings made in *Fiat Lux* either for *Papists*, *Protestants*, or others, be not certain, or perhaps not probable; yet he does nothing, except he be able to prove likewise, that they are not probable to *Fiat Lux*, or to those that use them, whether *Protestants* or *Papists*; which he can no more do, than he can pull a star out of the firmament. I say Sir again, and mark I pray you, what I say. If you should chance to evince that

that the reasons brought by *Fiat Lux* either for the doctrine or practises of Papists or others, be either not probable or untrue, yet is your labour all in vain, except you be able to demonstrate likewise, that they are not probable to *Fiat Lux*, or to Papists and others who use those reasons; which you can no more do, then any thing that is absolutely impossible. By this time Sir, you may discern how hard it is to deal with *Fiat Lux*, and impossible to confute him. Sith he speaks nothing, but what is as clearly true and evident, as what we see at mid-day. Nor do I in this any way exalt the ability of the Authour, whom you are pleased so much and frequently to disable. A Tom-fool may say that, which all the wisemen in the world cannot gain-say: as he did, who said the Sun was higher at noon, than any other hour of the day. It was *Fiat Lux* his fortune rather then choise, to utter words which will no sooner be read, than acknowledged. And it was your misfortune Sir, to employ your greater talents in refuting evident truths; perhaps for no other reason, but becaus they issued from the pen of a man, who is not so great a friend to faction, as you could wish. And although you proceed very harsh and furiously; yet am I verily perswaded, you now discern, though too late for your credit, that you had all this while, according to our English proverb, good Mr. Doctor, a wrong sow by the ear.



Thus far in general. Now briefly to give you  
som account in particular.

You spend four Chapters, and a hundred and  
eighteen pages, which is the fourth part of your  
book, before you com to the first line and para-  
graff of mine, *The applaus and honour of this  
world, &c.* And it is not unwittily done. For  
being to be led, as you heavily complain, out of  
your ordinary road of controversies, by the  
wilde chase of *Fiat Lux*, it behoved you to draw  
som general common places of your own, for  
your self to walk in, and exercise your rhetor-  
rick and anger, before you pursue a bird that  
flies not, you say, in any usual tract.

*Preface from page 1. to page 19.*

Your preface, wherein you speak of my sub-  
tilty and your own pretence, affords me nothing  
but the beginning of your own mistake, which  
will run quite through your book.

*I Chap. from page 19. to 29.*

Your first chapter beats me about the pate,  
for saying that I conceal my method, with a  
terrible syllogistical dilemma, *He that useth no  
method, say you, cannot conceal it, and if he hath  
concealed it, he hath used one.* But I must pass  
by store of such doughty stuff, being only fit  
for the young Oxford Schollar, who being com  
home to take air, would prove before his father  
and mother, that two eggs were three. Then  
going

going on you deny, that *Protestants ever opposed the doctrine and merit of good works*; which at first I wondered at, seeing the sound of it has rung so often in mine own ears, and so many hundred books written in this last age, so apparently witness it in all places, till I found afterwards in my thorough perusal of your book, that you neither heed what you say, or how much you do deny. But you perhaps love to talk of them better than your fore-fathers did, though your thoughts be all the same. And you will all equally bless your selves from building of Churches as the Papists have done, however your prattle goes.

2 Chap. from page 29. to 110.

Your second chapter collects out of *Fiat Lux*, as you say, ten general conclusions, spread all over like veins and arteries, in the body of that my book. And this you do, that you may make your self a *campus Martius* to sport in, without confinement to my method. But you name not any page of my book, where those principles may all or any of them be found. And you do wisely: For in the sense those words do either naturally make out, or in which you understand them, of all the whole ten I cannot own any one for mine own, set down in my book. The first of my principles must be this, *That we received the Gospel first from Rome*. In your sense I never spoke this. We, that is, we English first

received it thence. But you talk against it, as if I meant that Brittons had it first from *Rome*. *We had it not first from Rome*, say you, but by *Joseph of Arimathea from Palestine*, as *Fiat Lux* himself acknowledges. Sir, if *Fiat Lux* say both these things, he cannot mean in your contradictory false sense, but in his own true one. We, that is, we Englishmen, the now actual inhabitants of this Land, and progeny of the Saxons, received first our Gospel and Christendom from *Rome*; though the Brittons who inhabited this Land before us, differing as much from us as *Antipodes*, had some of them been Christened long before us. And yet the Christendom that prevailed and lasted among the Brittons, even they also as well as we, had it from *Rome* too: mark this likewise. But you reply, *Though persons from Rome did first plant Christianity among the Saxons, was it the Popes Religion they taught? did the Pope first finde it out? or did they Baptise in the name of the Pope?* Good Sir, it was the Popes Religion, not invented by him, as your cavil fondly imagines, but owned, professed, and put in practice by him, and from him derived unto us by his missionaries. You adde, *Did not the Gospel come to Rome as well as to us? for it was not first preached there.* Sir, properly speaking, it came not so to *Rome*, as it came to us. For one of the twelve fountains, nay two of the thirteen, and those the largest and greatest, was transferred to *Rome*, which

which they watered with their blood : we had never any such standing fountain of Christian Religion here, but only a stream derived to us from thence.

My second assertion must be, *From whom we first received our Religion, with them we must still abide.* This principle as it is never delivered by *Fiat Lux*, though you put it upon me, so is it in the latitude it carries, and wherein you understand it, absolutely fals, never thought of by me, and indeed impossible. For how can we abide with them in any truth, who may perhaps not abide in it themselves. Great part of *Flanders* was first converted by Englishmen, and yet are they not obliged, either by *Fiat Lux*, or any *lux* whatsoever, to accompany the English in our now present wayes. If *Rome* first taught us Christianity, she may then rather plead a power to guide us, than we her. This or some such like thing I might speak, and rationally speak it. But that we or any other should be obliged still to abide or rather to follow them who first taught us Religion, though they should themselves forsake their own doctrine, as you would make me speak, is a piece of folly never came into my thoughts. And you may be ashamed to put it upon me : Why do you not set down my own words, and the page of my book where I delivered this principle.

My third must be, *The Roman Religion is still*

+ *the same.* This also I do no where formally express, nor enter into any such common place : You will say I suppose it. But doth this justifie you who say here, that I assert it as a principle ; let it then be supposed, for I do indeed suppose it, becaus I know it hath been demonstrativly proved a hundred times over. You deny it has bin proved, why do you not then disprove it ? Be-  
 caus you decline, say you, *all common places.* Very good, so do I ; let us com to proper ones. You fall then upon my Queries in the end of my book. *The Roman was once a true flourishing Church, and if she ever fell, she must fall either by apostasie, heresie, or schism, &c.* So I speak there. And to this you reply, that *the Church that then was in the Apostles time, was indeed true, not that Roman Church that now is.* So, so ; then say I, that former true Church must fall then, som time or other ; when did she fall, and how did she fall ? by apostacy, heresy, or schism ? Per-  
 haps, say you, *neither way : for she might fall by an earthquake.* Sir, we speak not here of any casual or natural downfall or death of mortals by plague, famine, or earthquake, but a moral and voluntary laps in faith. What o you speak to me of earthquakes ! You adde therfor the second time, that *she might fall by idolatry ; and so neither by apostacy, heresy, or schism.* Good Sir, idolatry is a mixt misdemeanour : both in faith and manners : I speak of the single one of faith.

And

And he that falls by idolatry, if he keep still some parts of Christianity entire, he falls by heresy; by apostacy, if he keep none. At last finding your self puzzled, in the third place you lay on load; *She fell, say you, by apostacy, idolatry, heresy, schism, licentiousnes, and profanenes of life.* And in this you do, not much unlike the drunken youth, who being bid to hit his masters finger with his, when he perceived he could not do it, he ran his whole fist against it. But did she fall by apostacy? *By a partial one, say you, not a total one.* Good Sir, in this division, apostasy is set to expres a total relaps; in opposition to heresy, which is the partial. Did she then fall by heresy, or partial apostasy, in adhering to any error in faith, contrary to the approved doctrine of the Church? Here you smile seriously, and tell me, that *since I take the Roman and Catholik Church to be one, she could not indeed adhere to any thing but what she did adhere unto.* Sir I take them indeed to be one; but here I speak *ad hominem*, to one that does not take them so. And then, if indeed the Roman Church had ever swerved in faith, as you say she has, and be her self but as another ordinary particular Church, as you say she is; then might you find som one or other more general Church, if any ther were, positively to judg her; som Oecumenical council to condemn her; som fathers either greek or latin, expressly to write  
 against



against her, as Protestants now do; som or other grave solemn authority to censur her; or at least som company of beleevers out of whose body she went, and from whose faith she fell. Since you are no wayes able to assign any of these particulars, my Query remains unanswered, and the Roman still as flourishing a Church, as ever she was.

The fourth assertion, frequently, say you, *pleaded by our Authour is; that all things as to religion were ever quiet and in peace, before the Protestants relinquishment of the Roman Sea.* This principle you pretend is drawn out of *Fiat Lux*, not becaus it is there; but only to open a door for your self, to expatiate into som wide general discours, about the many wars, distractions, and factious altercations, that have been aforetime up and down the world, in som several ages of Christianity: And you therfor say *it is frequently pleaded by me*, becaus indeed I never speak one word of it. And it is in truth a fals and fond assertion. Though neither you nor I can deny, that such as keep unity of faith with that Church, can never so long as they hold it, fall out upon that account. If you had either cited the place, or set down my own words, they would have spoke their meaning. I might say perhaps, that our Land had no part of those disturbances upon the account of religion all the thousand years it was Catholik, which it hath  
 suf-

suffered in one age since, or the like. But that all things should ever be at quiet throughout the world, that ther should no heresies rise, no seditions, no wars any where; this is a fansy that was never in my head; and I wonder how it should drop into my paper. But you are a martial man, and resolved to bring me in with pikes and guns, as the red-coat souldiers did the Cavaliers in the time of our late anarchy, to suffer not only for the good they acted, but for the ill they never thought of.

Fift must be, *that the first reformers were most of them contemptible persons, their means indirect, and ends sinister.* Where is it Sir, where is it, that I meddle with any mens persons, or say they are contemptible, or their means indirect, or ends sinister? Where do I say all this? Do I speak any word of Reformers of Religion in general, as you make me to do. But this you adde of your own, in a vast universal notion, to the end you may bring in the apostles and prophets, and kings, into the list of persons by me surnamed contemptible, and liken my speech, who never speak any such thing, to the sarcasms of *Celsus*, *Lucian*, *Porphiry*, *Julian*, and other Pagans.

So likewise in the very beginning of this your second chapter you spend four leaves in a parallel betwixt me and the pagan *Celsus*, wherof ther is not any one member of it true. *Doth*

*Fiat*

*Fiat Lux*, say you, lay the cause of all the troubles, disorders, tumults, wars within the nations of Europe upon the Protestants? Doth he charge the Protestants, that by their schisms and seditions they make a way for other revolts? doth he gather a rapsody of insignificant words? doth he insist upon their divisions? doth he mannage the argument of the Jews against Christ, &c. So doth *Celsus*, who is confuted by learned Origen, &c. Where does *Fiat Lux*, where does he, does he, does he any such thing? Are you not ashamed to talk at this rate? I give a hint indeed of the divisions that be amongst us, and the frequent argumentations that are made to embroil and puelle one another, with our much evil, and little appearance of any good, in order to unity and peace, which is the end of my discours. But must I therfor be *Celsus*? Did *Celsus* do any such thing to such an end? It is the end that moralises and specifies the action. To diminish Christianity by upbraiding our frailties is paganish: to exhort to unity by representing the inconvenience of faction, is a Christian and pious work. When honest Protestants in the Pulpit speak ten times more full and vehemently against the divisions, wars, and contentions that be amongst us, than ever came into my thoughts; must they therfor be, every one of them a *Celsus*, a pagan *Celsus*? what stuff is this! But it is not only my defamation you aim at, your own  
glory

glory comes in the rear. If I be *Celsus*, the pagan *Celsus*; then must you forsooth be *Origen* that wrote against him, honest *Origen*. That is the thing. Pray Sir, it is but a word; let me advise you by the way, that you do not forget your self in your heat, and give your wife occasion to fall out with you. However you may, yet will not she like it perhaps so well, that her husband should be *Origen*.

My sixth principle must be, *That our departure from Rome hath been the cause of all our evils*. This is but the same with the fourth, in other words, but added for one to make up the number. And it is, you say, *every where spread over the face of Fiat Lux*. Sir you may say what you pleas, to be in his face, but I know best what is in the heart and bowels, both of *Fiat Lux*, and his Authour. And sure I am this never came into my thoughts. Our dissentions in faith may well multiply, as we see with our eyes they do, by our further departure from unity; and this may cause much evil. But the branches of our too too manifold evils found among the sons of men, spread all, as *Fiat Lux* also speaks, from that fertile root of our innate concupiscence, which by evil customs rises up into a thick bole of vicious inclinations, while we study not to impair, but rather to augment and nourish it. However I must give you leave to number this among my silly principles, to the end you may talk more copiously of  
the

the disputes, and wars and broils that are and have been in several parts of Christendom, and fall again into your much affected and often iterated strain. *So the Pagans judged the Primitive Christians, &c.* And I must still be the Pagan, and you the Primitive Christian.

+ Seventh is, *There is no remedy of our evils, but by a returning to the Roman Sea.* This and the principle foregoing, had not you warily cloven a hair, had been all one, and both are equally mine. But Sir, that may remedy our difference in faith, which neither can nor will prevent varieties in philosophy or other worldly judgments: nor considering the infinite diversity of mens humours, is there any one thing equally prevalent with all men, and at all times, to the like good effect; and if it do certainly help one evil, it is not therfor a remedy for all. But it seems you have yet a little more mirth and choller to vent, and therfor I must permit you to adde this principle for mine, that you may smilingly consider, how the Romans should cure our evils, that cannot prevent disorders, differences, and sins amongst themselves. I can tell you Sir another remedy of our evils, that we suffer about dissentions in Religion, besides that. If the King and Parliament would please to give back all the ecclesiastical livings into the hands of secular gentlemen, who out of a blind zeal, as you phrase it, gave them up aforetime

time unto the pious uses of spirituall men now no more extant, all our controversies and the evils thence ensuing would soon ceas. Even you zealous Sir, would be then as quiet, as a wolf tumbled into a pit-fall. Other remedies I could yet acquaint you with, more than one or two. If you did Sir really, and not in words only acknowledge any one superiour governour in the land, unto whose power and judgment you would heartily all of you resign, the word of that Oracle would solve all doubts, and end all your quarrels. But you will never do it. The very genius of the Reformation is wholly set against it.

The eight follows, *That Scriptur on sundry accounts is insufficient to settle us in the truth.* And in this you flourish and triumph most copiously for fifteen pages together, as the champion of the word of God. But Sir, you speak not one word to the purpos, or against me at all, if I had delivered any such principle, which I never did. Gods word is both the sufficient and only necessary means both of our conversion and settlement as well in truth as vertue. But Sir, the thing you heed not, and unto which I only speak, if I any where hint at such a thing, is this: If the Scriptur be in two hands, for example of the Protestant Church in *England*, and of the Puritan, who with that scriptur rose up and rebelled against her, can the scriptur alone of it self

self decide the busines, how shall it do it, has it ever don it? or can that written word now solitary and in private hands so settle any in a way that neither himself nor present adherents, nor future generations shall question it; or with as much probability dissent from it either totally or in part, as himself first set it. This Sir is the case, unto which you do neither here nor in all your whole book speak one word. And what you speak otherwis of the Scripturs excellency, I allow it for good. What is not against me, is with me. But no law whatsoever, whether divine or humane can be a sufficient rule to men, if no judge oversee it.

Ninth, *The Pope is a good man, and seeks nothing but our good.* This also I no where aver. I might mention the care and industry of that Sea, and affirm it to be unworthily traduced. But I never saw any Pope, nor have I any such acquaintance with him, as to know whether he be a good man in your sence or no; free from pride, anger, covetousnes, &c. though in charity I do not use to judg hardly of any body. Much less could I say, that he whom I know to have a general solicitude for all Churches, seeks nothing but our good. Sir, if I had pondered my words in *Fiat Lux*, no better than you heed yours in your *Animadversions* upon it, they might even go together both of them to lap pepper and spice, or som other yet more vile employment.

Tenth



Tenth, that the devotion of Catholics far transcends that of Protestants. But Sir I never made in *Fiat Lux* any comparison between their devotions, nor do I remember that I ever so much as mentioned the devotion of Protestants. But you are the maddest Commentator I have ever seen, you first make the *Text*, and then *Animadversions* upon it. Here at length you conclude your chapter, and would, say you, your book also; if you had none to deal with, but ingenious and judicious readers. It seems what follows, is for readers neither judicious nor ingenious. And because I knew you took me for one of those, I went on in my view. Indeed, had I not undertaken to give you an account of your whole book, I could have been well content to stop here with ingenious and judicious readers, and look no further. Doubtless in this affair good wits will jump. You would write no more; had you none but judicious readers; and these will read no more, because they are judicious. But I poor ass must jogge on.

3 ch. from page 110. to 119.

Your third chapter concerns my preface, which in part you allow, and partly dislike. And I am equally content with both.

4 or 5 ch from page 119. to 148.

Your fourth chapter by mistake of press is named fifth, and so I must here call it. It begins my book, and takes up five of my paragraphs at once.

once, You have loitered long about the gate like a trifling idlesbee, and means now it seems, when you come to my own words, to go nimbly over them, as of lesser concernment than your own forestalled conceits, which you have hitherto made sport with. You first set up a maypole, and then danced about it, and now at length half tired, and almost out of breath, you come home to me.

2 My first paragraff about Diversity of feuds you do not much except against. But I see you do not affect the *schoolmen*, haply for the same reason the French love not *Talbot*, having been used in their infancy to be frightened with that name. However you think I have good reason to make honourable mention of them, because they were, say you, the hammerers and forgers of *Poperie*. Alas Sir, I see that anger spoils your memory; for in the twelfth and thirteenth chapter of that very book of your *Animadversions*, you make *Poperie* to be hammered and forged not a few hundred of years, before any *schoolmen* were extant. You check me also for saying, that reformation of religion is pretended by emulous Plebeians, as though, say you, *Hzekiah, Josiah, and other good Kings and Princes also of our own were emulous Plebeians*. But Sir, when I say in *Fiat Lux*, p. 20. what glory the emulous Plebeian sees given to higher spirits, &c. I only speak of the times of vulgar insurrection against

against authority; as all men see except your self, who will not.

My second paragraft of the *Ground of quarrels* you like well enough, and explicate it with a text to help me out. I could not haply tell, how to cite *James*, the fourth chapter, the first and second vers of that chapter, without your help. However, it is kindnes though it be but cours; as *Sir Thomas Moor* told his maid, when she kist him as he was going to execution; and so I take it.

My third paragraft about *nullity of title*, would, you think, every period of it confute my self. But that saying of *S. Paul*, *An à vobis verbum Dei processit, an ad vos solos pervenit*, which I make use of to stop the mouths of all vitilitigatours in religion, was cited by me, you think, in an unhappy hour; becaus, say you, *ther is not any one single text of scriptur more fatal to papal pretensions*. And why so Sir? *Becaus* the Gospel you say, came to Rome as well as it came to us here in England. And this is all you say, to prove that text to be so fatal to papal pretensions. To this Sir I have already told you, that it came not to us as it came to Rome: and now I tell you again, that it came to us from Rome, and not to Rome from us. And therfor is that text fatal to us, not to them: It may open their mouths, but I am sure it stops ours.

*Heats and resolutions*, the subject of my fourth

paragraff, which your self will not countenance, you will not permit me to dislike. You may talk against them, and I may not. But I may be excused; for I knew not then, such a man of art as your self, would speak of that he understood better then I do.

The *motives of moderation* in my sixth paragraff you laugh at; and I will not stop your merriment. But in all this say you *Fiat Lux hath a secret design*, which your eagle-sighted eye has discovered. And *in vain is the net spread before the eyes of a thing that hath a wing*. And I must know, that the authour of *Animadversions*, is that thing that hath a wing.

6 ch. from page 148. to 177.

Your sixth chapter, which meets just with my sixth paragraff of the *Obscurity of God*, in the beginning, where you declare the sufficient knowledg we have of God by divine revelation, whereunto by our humble beleef we have subscribed our consent, is right and good; but not at all against me, who there treat a case of metaphysical concernment, which you apprehend not. It is no wonder then, you should so much dislike all that my plea of uncertainty, not only before any teacher appear, but after too; whiles you take the teacher and his words as they walk hand in hand actually linkt together with our beleef in him; which actual beleef my supposition suspends and separates, to the end I may consider

sider whether any such teacher can appear so accomplisht as to move us, who live in this present age, and coin religion anew, to a beleef invariable: so that through your too much haste, you utterly mistake all my whole discours, and speak nothing at all to the case I treat of. I speak wholly there, as in other parts of *Fiat Lux*, upon a supposition of the condition, the generality of people are now actually in, here in *England*, where every one lets himself loose at pleasure to frame opinions and religions of themselves. And so cannot be thought to speak of a settled beleef, but only of settling one, or one to be settled; which there and elsewhere in that book, I endeavour to show impossible to be so fixedly stated by any private man, but that himself and others may rationally doubt it. And that therfor our only way is to beleev and not dispute, to submit to the old way we have formerly received, and not to surmise a new. This is the very substance, scope and purpos not only of that paragraff, but of my whole book, which you do as utterly swerve from, as ever any blinded man, put to thrash a cock, misplaced his blow. Perhaps it is hard for you to conceive your self in a state you are not actually in at present: And if you cannot do this, you will be absolutely unfit to deal with such hypothetick discourses, as I see indeed you are. *Bellarmins* little catechise had been a fitter book for you

to write *Animadversions* upon, than my *Fiat Lux*. There is good positive doctrine, signed *hic & nunc*, and specified to your inclination and capacity. I meddle not with any; I deliver no positive doctrine at all; I never descend to any particular conclusion or *thesis* of faith; I defend no opinion but only this, *That every opinion is defensible, and yet none impregnable*. Do you not blush Sir, to see your own gross mistake. God is my witness, when I finde you, misled by your own error, so furiously to tax me with ignorance, fraud, blasphemy, atheisme, I cannot but pitty you. And generally you talk at random, as well in this chapter as others. Let me give som little hint of it in particular, for this once.

Where I in my foresaid paragragh say, that *differences of faith in its branches are apt to infer a suspicion in its very root, and consequently atheism*. To this you reply, that *That discours of mine is all rotten: that Christian religion it self might thus be questioned: that it is the argument of the Pagan Celsus: that such contests have ever been: that Protestants are resolved: that Catholiks turn atheists as well as others: that our religion is the same yesterday and to day: that our evils are from our selves, &c.* Doth this talk concern or plead to my assertion? I know all this, as well as you; but that it is nothing to the purpos, that I know, and you it seems do not. Though all this  
you

you say be true, yet still it remains notwithstanding as true and certain as it was before, and that is certain enough, That difference of faith in its branches are apt to infer a suspicion in its very root, and consequently atheism. You have but beaten the air.

So likewise unto all that discours of mine, If the Papist or Roman Catholik, who first brought us the news of our Christianity, be now becom so odious, then may likewise the whole story of our Christianity be at length thought a Romance. You speak with the like extravagancy, and mind not my hypothetick at all, to speak directly to my inference, as it became a man of art to do. But neglecting my consequence, which in that discours is principally and solely intended, you seem to deny my supposition; which, if my discours had been drawn into a syllogism, would have been the minor part of it. And it consists of two categories; first, that the Papist is now becom odious: second, that the Papist delivered us the first news of Christianity. The first of these you little heed, the second you deny; That the Papist, say you, or Roman Catholik first brought Christ and his Christianity into this land is most untrue, I wonder, &c. And your reason is, becaus if any Romans came hither, they were not Papists, and indeed our Christianity came from the East, namely by Joseph of Arimathea, &c. And this is all you say to my hypothetick or conditional ratiocina-



tion; as if I had said nothing at all but that one absolute category, which being delivered before, I now only suppose. You use to call me a civil logician, but I fear a natural one as you are, will hardly be able to justify this motion of yours as artificial. A conditional hath a verity of its own, so far differing from the supposed category, that this being fals that may yet be true. For example, if I should say thus: A man who hath wings as an eagle, or if a man had wings as an eagle, he might fly in the air, as well as another bird. Such an assertion is not to be confuted by proving that a man hath not the wings of an eagle. Yet so you deal with me here, a great master of arts with a civil logician. But, that I may go along with you, we had not Sir our Christianity immediately from the East, nor from *Joseph of Arimathea*, as I have already told you, we Englishmen had not. For as he delivered his Christianity to som Brittons, when our land was not called *England* but *Albion*, or *Brittany*, and the inhabitants were not Englishmen but Brittons or Kimbrians, so likewise did that Christianity and the whole news of it quite vanish, being sodainly overwhelmed by the ancient deluge of paganisme: nor did it ever come from them to us. Nay, the Brittons themselves had so forgot and lost it, that even they also needed a second conversion, which they received from Pope *Eleutherius*. And that was the

the onely news of Christianity which prevailed and lasted even amongst the very Brittons : which seems to me a great secret of divine providence in planting and governing his Church ; as if he would have nothing to stand firm and lasting , but what was immediately fixed and seated upon that rock. For all other conversions have vanished, and the very seats of the other Apostles failed , that all might the better cement in an unity of one head. Nay the tables which God made with his own hand were broken, but the other framed by *Moses* remained, that we might learn to give a due respect to him whom God hath set over us as our head and ruler under him , and none exalt himself against him. I know you will laugh at this my observation, but I cannot but tell you what I think. To return then to my former discours ; when I speak good Sir , of the news of Christianity first brought to this land, I mean not that which was first brought upon the earth or soil of this land , and spoken to any body then dwelling here ; but which was delivered to the fore-fathers of the now present inhabitants , who be Saxons or Englishmen. And I say that we , the now present inhabitants of *England*, off-spring of the English or Saxons, had the first news of our Christianity immediately from *Rome* , and from Pope *Gregorius* the Roman Patriarch , by the hands of his missionary *St. Austin*. And this  
all

all men know to be as true, as they know that Papists are now becom odious. Sith then the categorick assertions, are both clear; namely, that the Papist first brought us the news of Christianity; and secondly, that the Papist is now becom odious amongst us; what say you to my consequence? that the whole story of Christianity may as well be deemed a Romance, as any part of that Christianity we at first received, as now judged to be part of a Romance. This consequence of mine it behoved a man of those great parts you would be thought to have, to heed attentively; and yet you never mind it.

You adde in the close of your discourse, that *many things delivered us at first with the first news of Christianity may be afterwards rejected for the love of Christ, and by the commission of Christ?* But Sir, what love of Christ dictates, what commission of Christ allows you, to choos and reject at your own pleasure? what heretick was ever so much a fool, as not to pretend the love of Christ, and commission of Christ for what he did? How shall any one know you do it, out of any such either love or commission? sith those who delivered the articles of faith now rejected, pretended equal love of Christ and commission of Christ, for the delivery of them, as of any other. And why may we not at length reject all the rest, for love of something els?

when

when this love of Christ, which is now crept out into the very outside of our lips, is slipt off thence. Do you think men cannot finde a cavil against him, as well as his law delivered unto us with the first news of him? and as easily dig up the root, as cut up the branches? Is not the thing already don, and many becom atheists upon that account? Pray speak to me somthing of reason. Did not the Jews by pretens of their love to that immortal God, whom their forefathers served, reject the whole Gospel at once? and why may not we possibly as well do it by peece-meals! Let us leav cavils: Grant my supposition which you know you cannot deny: then speak to my consequence, which I deem most strong and good, to infer a conclusion which neither you nor I can grant. I tell you plainly and without tergiversation, before God and all his holy angels, what I should think, if I descended unto any conclusion in this affair. And it is this: either the Papist, who holds at this day all those articles of faith which were delivered at the first conversion of this land by *St. Austin*, is unjustly becom odious amongst us; or els my honest Parsons throw off your cassocks, and resign your benefices and glebe-lands into the hands of your neighbours, whose they were aforetime: my consequence is irrefragable.

If any part, much more if many parts, great sub-

2 substantial parts of religion brought into the land with the first news of Christianity, be once rejected (as they are now amongst us) as Romish or Romancical, and that rejection or reformation be permitted, then may other parts and all parts, if the gap be not stopt, be lookt upon at length as points of no better a condition. Nay it must needs be so : for the same way and means that lopt off som branches, will do the like to others, and root too : A villification of that Church, wherein they find themselves, who have a minde to prevaricate, upon pretens of Scriptur and power of interpreting, light, spirit, or reason, adjoynd with a personal obstinacy that will not submit, will do it roundly and to effect. This first brought off the Protestants from the Roman catholik Church ; this lately separated the Presbyterian from the English Protestant Church, the Independent from the Presbyterian, the Quaker from other Independents. And this last good man heeds nothing of Christian religion but only the moral part, which in deed and truth is but honest paganisme. This speech is worthy of all serious consideration. And I could wish you would ponder it seriously. See if the *Quaker* deny not as resolutely the regenerating power of baptism, as you the efficacy of absolution. See if the *Presbyterian* do not with as much reason evacuate the prelacy of Protestants, as they the Papacy. See if the *Socinian* argu-

arguments against the Trinity, be not as strong as yours against the real presence in the Eucharist. See if the *Jew* do not with as much plausibility deride Christ, as you his Church. See if *Porphyry*, *Julian*, and other ancient pagans, do not as strongly confute all Christianity, as we any part of it. He is a fool, that having a will and power enough, cannot find out as plausible a pretence for the pulling down of Churches, as we had any for the destroying of Monasteries. Ther be books lately set forth, and by more then one authour here in this land, which do as powerfully dissipate the conceit we once had of he'll, as any ever did elude Purgatory. Did we not lately find out texts and reasonings against our King and monarchy, as many as we found out long ago against Pope and popery? Gods providence and our souls immortality if any list to deny, he may have more abundant argumentations every where occurring, than any other piece of popery now rejected ever felt. If one text of scriptur be by a trope of rhetorick made to speak a sens, contrarty to what was beleaved in catholik times in any one point, cannot another text by some such slight be forced to frustrate another. I am sure it may do so, and has done so. And thus when all articles are at last by such tricks of wit cashiered, can there be wanting several appearing incongruities, contradictions, tautologies, improbabilities, to dis-

able

able all holy writ at once. And cannot the Jew afford us at last arguments enough, to dissipate at length the very name of Christ out of the world, which after the whole extirpation of his law, will but float on mens lips like an empty shadow, till it quite vanish. These things Sir, are not only true, but clear and evident. And nothing is wanting to justify them, but a serious consideration.

These few words Sir, which I have bestowed upon you by way of supererogation, above what I needed, will somewhat inlighten you to discern the goodnes and necessity of my consequence. *If the Papist who first brought us the news of Christianity be now becom odious, then may all Christianity at length be thought a Romance, &c.* Religion like a hous, if a breach be once made and not repaired to former unity, will by degrees all moulder away, till no one room be left intire.

7 ch. from page 177. to 188.

Your seventh chapter finished in five leafs, runs, or flies over two or three of my paragraffs at once, which make up above fifty pages, concerning the obscurity of *Nature and Providence*. All which discours of mine is, you say, *nothing to my purpos*, but foisted in for *a blinde to entertain my readers*. But Sir, those judicious readers you lately left behind you, who discern my purpos better than I see you do, will tell you, that



that it is so much to my purpos, that nothing could be more. At least you let all pass without either censure or commendation, till you meet happily at length with a word or two of mine (let fall in my ninth paragraft called *Help*) about *scripture*. This makes your heart leap; it is a common place you know how to sport in, and you never meet with that sound, but it makes you dance. Your chapter then, which is written against all my philosophical discours of *nature* and *providence*, is called *scripture vindicated*, as though I had industriously wrote against *scripture*. And therein you sweetly dilate upon the excellency and goodnes of the word of God, as if I had any way diminished it, or wrote against it; just according to the tone of our late dismal times, *Lord, I am for thy caus Lord, I am left alone to plead thy caus Lord against thine enemies*. But Sir, the few words I there speak, only incidentally, in the end of that my paragraft called *Help*, concerning the surmises that men have about *scriptur*, as they be but a small part of the many, which I know to be now vented up and down the land in this our present state of separation one from another; so if I had not given som touch of them in that metaphysick abstracted discours of *Fiat Lux*, which proceeds, as I have said upon a supposition of our chusing and making religions here in *England* at pleasur, unto endles differences and divisions, it had been a maimed

mained and imperfect work, and no wayes satisfactory unto those judicious readers unto whom I write; though you do not. And I cannot but tell you, whatsoever you think of your self, you are in truth, except you dissemble and mistake on purpos, but a weak man, to take that as spoken absolutely by me, and by way of positive doctrine, which I only deliver upon an *hypothesis* apparent to all the world besides your self. You would make a mad commentatour upon *Solomons Ecclesiastes*. I speak upon a supposition of doubting, which these times have brought upon us, of interpreting, accepting, rejecting, framing, forging religions and opinions to our selves; and you reply against me words and discourses that presuppose an assent of beleeving. If a man beleeve, he cannot doubt. And if he doubt not of the scriptures truth, he cannot make exceptions against any of its properties. But if any begin to question this or that, or other part of doctrine contained in scripture, and delivered by those who first brought it, as every one does who swerves from the Church he found himself in; then I suppose such a one doubts. And being now thereby separated from that body of believers to which he before by faith adhered, he cannot now left to himself, but proceed, if he give attendance to the conduct of his own surmising thoughts, to more suspicions then I was willing to expresse.

But

BUT Sir, what you say here, and so often up and down your book, of Papists contempt of scriptur, I beseech you will please to abstain from it for the time to com: I have conversed with the Roman catholiks of *France, Flandets, and Germany*; I have read more of their books, both histories, contemplatives, and scholastick divines, than I beleev you have ever seen or heard of. I have seen the devotion both of common people, colledges of sacred priests, and religious houses; I have communed with all sorts of people, and perused their councils. And after all this, I tell you, and out of my love I tell you, that their respect to scriptur is real, absolute and cordial even to admiration. Others may talk of it, but they act it, and would be ready to stone that man that should diminish holy writ: Let us not wrong the innocent. The scriptur is theirs, and Jesus Christ is theirs, who also will plead their caus when he sees time.

8. ch. from page 188 to 198.

In your eight chapter, which falls upon my paragraff of *Reason*, you are absolutely in a wood; and wonder more then ordinary, how *that discours of mine, concerning reason to be excluded from the imploiment of framing articles of religion, can any wayes concern Protestants; or be a confutation of Protestants.* As though *Fiat Lux* were written to any such concernment against Protestants. Your head is so full, it seems of that con-

troverting faculty for *Protestants* against *Papists*, that if *Popery* be but mentioned in a book without an epithet of detestation, you conclude presently, that the book is written for *Popery* against *Protestants*. And if every thing therein contained, answer not the idea of your brain, then it is impertinent with you, it is silly, it is besides the purpos. And this censur you have given, still as you have gone along all my whole book hitherto, of every part and parcel of it, even from my preface to this present paragraft of *Reason*. You cannot see how all that vain flourishing discours of mine, concerning diversity of feuds, ground of quarrels, nullity of title, heats and resolution, motives to moderation, obscurity of God, natur and providence, or the like, should confute *Protestancy*, or any way concern *Protestants*. And therfor it is wholly impertinent. Thus the famous Knight, when he had once conceived an idea of his own errantry, every flock of sheep must be an army, and every wind-mill a giant, or els it is impertinent to *Don Quixot*.

9 ch. from page 198 to 213.

Your ninth chapter upon my paragraft of *Light and Spirit*; is wholly spent, neglecting all my other discours, in solving the *Jewish objection*, which I answer my self. And if you have added any thing better than mine, I shall be thankful for it as soon as I see it. But I fear your vaunting flourishes about scriptur which you love to

talk

talk on, will not without the help of your *Credo* and humble resignation, solve the argument; which that you may the easier be quit of, you never examin; but only run on in your usual flourishes about the *use and excellency* of Gods word. I told you in *Fiat Lux*, what the Jew will reply to all such reasonings, but you have the pregnant wit not to heed any thing that may hinder your flourishes. But Sir, if you were kept up in a chamber with a learned Jew, without bread water and fire, till you had satisfied him in that objection; I am still well enough assured, for all your aery vaunts, that if you do not make use of your *Credo*, which here you contemn, you might there stay till hunger and cold had made an end of you. But I beleev you love not such dry blows; however you may be delighted with pen encounters at a distance, where after your *suppositum* has been well inspired with the warm spirits blown hither out of the fortunate islands, you may cavil revile and threaten at your pleasure, and knock down the shadow of your adversary which your own spirits have raised up, and presented to you in your chamber.

10 ch. from page 213 to 228.

Your tenth chapter runs over two of my paragraphs, which speak the plea of *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, and *Protestants*. That you esteem idle, the other senseless, the last insufficient. And to make this last good, you endeavour to disab

both what I have set down to make against the prelate Protestant, and also what I have said for him. I said in *Fiat Lux*, that it made not a little against our Protestants, that after the prelate Protestantcy was settled in *England*, they were forced for their own preservation against Puritans, to take up som of those principles again, which former Protestants had cast down for Popish, as is the *authority* of a visible Church, efficacy of *ordination*, difference between *clergy* and *laity*, &c. Here first you deny that those principles are popish. But Sir, ther be som Jews even at this day, who will deny any such man as *Pontius Pilate*, to have ever been in *Jury*. I have other things to do, than to fill volums with useles texts, which here I might easily do, out of the books both of the first reformers, and catholik divines and counsels. Then secondly you challenge me to prove, that those principles were ever denied by our prelate Protestants. And this you do wittily and like your self. You therfor bid me prove that those principles were ever denied by our prelate Protestants, becaus I say, that our prelate Protestants here in *England*, as soon as they became such, took up again those forenamed principles, which Protestants their forefathers both here in *England* and beyond the seas, before our prelacy was set up, had still rejected. When I say then, that our prelate Protestant affirmed and asserted those principles which for-

mer Protestants denied, you bid me prove that our prelate Protestant ever denied them.

Thus you contradict what I say is pleaded against our prelate Protestant. And again you do as stiffly gain-say what I plead for him my self. You laugh at me even with head and shoulders, and tell me, *that the prelate-Protestant has far better arguments for themselves, then either mine is, or any I can bring; nor do they need the help of such a weak logician as my self, in this their caus.* Sir give me leav to tell you here once for all, that I thought it sufficient for my design, to set down either for Papist or Protestant, when occasion required, such reasons as appeared plausible to my self; and to say all for them that can be said, was neither the work of my small ability, nor any purpos of my design. And it is enough to me, that I know no better. But let us see what my argument is, and how you crush it.

*The Church, say I, must have a byskop, or otherwise she will not have such a visible head, as she had at first, &c.* This that you may evacuate, you tell me, *that the Church hath still the same head she had, which is Christ, who is present with his Church by his Spirit and laws, and is man-God still as much as ever he was, and ever the same will be: and if I would have any other visible bishop to be that head, then it seems I would not have the same head, and so would have the same and yet not the same.* Thus you speak.



But Sir, I cannot in any reason be thought to speak otherwise, if we would use true logick, of the identity of the head, than I do of the identity of the body of the Church. This body is not numerically the same : for the men of the first age are long ago gone out of the world, and another generation com, who yet are a body of Christians of the same kind ; becaus they adhere to the same principles of faith. And as the body is of the same kind, though not numerically the same ; so do I require, that since Jesus Christ as man, the head immediate of other beleeving men, is departed hence to the glory of his Father, that the Church should still have a head of the same kind, as visibly now present, as she had in the beginning ; or els say I, she cannot be completely the same body, or a body of the same kind she was. But this she hath not, this she is not, except she have a visible byshop, as she had in the beginning, present with her, guiding and ruling under God. Christ our Lord is indeed still man-God, but this man-hood is now separate ; nor is he visibly now present as man, which immediately headed his beleevers under God, on whose influence that natur depended. His God-head is still the same in all things, not only in it self, but in order also to his Church, as it was before, equally invisible, and in the like manner beleevd ; but the natur delegate under God, and once ruling visibly amongst us by words and examples,

examples, is now utterly withdrawn. And if a natur of the same kind, be not now delegate with a power of exterior government, as at the first ther was, then hath not the Church the same head now, which she had then, nor is she the same polity or body she was before: *Qui habet aures audiendi audiat.*

And here by the way we may take notice what a sincere English Protestant you are, who labour so stoutly to evacuate my argument for episcopacy, and leav none of your own behind you, nor acquaint the world with any, although *you know far better*; but would make us beleev notwithstanding those far better reasons for prela-cy, that Christ himself, as he is the immediate and only head of the invisible influence, so is he likewise the only and immediate head of visible direction and government among us, without the interposition of any person delegate in his stead, to oversee and rule under him in his Church on earth: which is against the tenour both of sacred gospel, and *S. Pauls* epistles, and all antiquity, and the present ecclesiastick polity of *England*; and is the doctrin not of any English Protestant, but of the Presbyterian, Independent, and Quaker.

Christ then in your way is immediate head not only of subministration and influence, but of exterior direction and government to his Church. Pray tell me, is he such an immediate

head to all beleevers, or no? if he be to all, then is no man to be governed in affairs of religion by any other man; and Presbyterian Ministers are as needles, as either Catholik or Protestant byshops. On the other side, if he be not immediate head to all, but ministers head the people, and Christ heads the ministers, this in effect is nothing els, but to make every minister a byshop. Why do you not plainly say, what it is more than manifest you would have. All this while you heed no more the laws of the land, than constitutions of gospel.

As for gospel; That Lord, who had been visible governour and paltour of his flock on earth, when he was now to depart hence, as all the apostles expected one to be chosen to succeed him in his care, so did he, notwithstanding his own invisible presence and providence over his flock, publicly appoint one. And when he taught them, that he who were greatest among them should be as the least, he did not deny but suppose one greater, and taught in one and the same breath, both that he was over them, and for what he was over them, namely to feed, not to tyrannize, not to domineer, abuse, and hurt, but to direct, comfort, and conduct his flock, in all humility and tendernes, as the servant of all their spiritual necessities. And if a byshop be otherwise affected, it is the fault of his person, not his place.

As

As for the laws of the land, it is there most strongly decreed by the consent and authority of the whole Kingdom, not only that byshops are over ministers, but that the Kings majesty is head of byshops also in the line of hierarchy, from whose hand they receive both their place and jurisdiction. This was establisht not onely by one, but several acts and constitutions, both in the reign of King *Edward* and Queen *Elizabeth*. So that by the laws of the land ther be two greeces between ministers and Christ; which you cut off, to the end you may secretly usurp the authority and place of both, to the overthrow at once both of gospel and our law too.

|                |           |          |
|----------------|-----------|----------|
| By the laws    | God       | God      |
| of our land    | Christ    | Christ   |
| our series of  | King      | Minister |
| ecclesiastical | Byshop    | People.  |
| government     | Ministers |          |
| stands thus.   | People    |          |

So that the Ministers head in the Presbyterian predicament, touches Christs feet immediately, and nothing intervenes. You pretend indeed, that hereby you do exalt Christ; but this is a meer cheat, as all men may see with their eyes; for Christ is but where he was; but the minister indeed is exalted, being now set in the Kings place, one degree higher than the byshops, who by the law is under both King and byshop too.

You

You will here say to me, *What is the Papists line of Church government. There the Pope must sit next Christ, and Kings under his feet.* Sir, I have not time in this short letter to discours this subject as it deserves. Nor does it now concern me, who have no more here to say than only this; that my argument for prelacy, howsoever in your words you may disable it, is not weakened by you in deeds at all, and as far as I can perceiv, not understood. Yet two things I shall tell you over and above what I need in this affair also.

First is, that Roman catholiks do more truly and cordially acknowledg the respective Christian King of any Kingdom to be supream head of his catholik subjects even in affairs of religion, than any other, whether Independents, Presbyterians, or even prelate Protestants have, if we speak of truth and reality, ever done. And this I could easily make good both by the laws and practises of all catholik kingdoms upon earth in any age on one side, and the opposite practises of all Protestants on the other. Second is, that for what reasons Roman catholiks deny a prince to be head of the Church, for the same ought all others as they deny it in deeds, so, if they would speak sincerely as they think and act, to deny it in words also as well as they. For catholiks do beleev him to be head of the Church, from whom the channel of religion  
and

and all direction in it is derived and flows; for which reason a spring is said to be head of a river. But neither does any King upon earth, except he be priest and prophet too, ever trouble himself to derive religion, as the Pope has ever done: neither does either Protestant, Presbyterian or Independent, either in *England* or elsewhere, ever seek for religion from the lips of the king, or supplicate unto him when any doubt arises in those affairs, as they ought in conscience and honesty to do, for a final decision, any more than the Roman catholik does. So that whatever any of them may say, all Protestants do as much deny the thing in their behaviour, as catholiks do in words; and catholiks do in their behaviour observe as much, as Protestants either practise or pretend. What is the reason that Roman catholiks in all occurring difficulties of faith, both have their recours unto their papal Pastour, (unto whom Kings themselves remit them) and acquiesce also to his decision and judgment, but only because they beleev him to be head of the Church. And if Protestants have no such recours, nor will not acquiesce to his Majesties authority in affairs of religion, but proceed to wars and quarrels without end, the prince neglected as wholly unconcerned in those resolves, they do as manifestly deny his headship, as if they profest none. Nay, to acknowledge a headship in words, and deny it in deeds, is but mockery.

mockery. By these two words Sir, it may appear, that the Kings majesty is as much head of the Church to Roman Catholiks as to any Protestants; and these no more than they either derive religion or decision of their doubts from the kings chair,

Itch interim it is a shame and general scandal to the whole world, that we in *England* should neither supplicate nor acquiesce in affairs of religion to his Majesties judgment, whom in words we acknowledg head of the Church, but fight and quarrel without end; and yet have the confidence to upbraid Roman catholiks with a contrary beleef, who although they ever looked upon their papal patriarch as spiritual head and pastour and deriver of their faith, unto whom they so submit, that he who after his decision remains contumacious forfeits his Christianity, yet have they notwithstanding in all ages and kingdoms assigned with a most ready cordial reverence unto all decisions, orders and acts of their temporal princes even in spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs, as well as civil, so far as their laws reached, as supreme head and governors of their respective kingdoms. And all kings and princes find in a very short space, however others may utter hypocritical words of flattery, that indeed none but catholik subjects do heed and fear and observ them universally, in all whatever their commands, being taught



taught by their religion, of which they alone give account at times appointed for penance, to hearken and obey for conscience sake all higher powers, constituted over them for good.

That catholiks do universally observ their King in all affairs as well ecclesiastick as civil, I need not, to make it good, send you Sir either to the testimonies of civil law and *Codex of Justinian*, or the other various constitutions of so many several provinces and kingdoms, as are and have been in Christendom, our own home will suffice to justifie it. Were not the spiritual courts, both court Christian, Prerogative court and Chancery, all set up in catholik times, about matters of religion, and affairs of conscience, and all mannaged by clerks or clergy-men under the King? In brief, where ever any civil coaction or coactive power intervenes, be it in what affair it will, all such power and action who ever uses it, hath it autoritatively only from the King. For neither Pope, nor Byshop, nor any Priest ought to be a striker, as *S. Paul* teaches: nor have they any lands, or livings, or court, or power to compel or punish either in goods or body, but what is lent or given by princes and princely men, out of their love and respect to Jesus Christ and his holy gospel, whose news they first conveyed about the world; although a just donation is, I should think, as good a title,

as either emption, inheritance, or conquest, if it be irrevocable. The King is the only striker in the land *ex jure*, and the sword of the almighty is only in his hand; and none can compel or punish either in body or goods, but only himself, or others by his commission, in any whatever affair. He can either by his authority and laws blunt the sword of those who have one in their hand, whether by pact or nature, as have masters over servants, and parents over children; or put a civil power into the hands of those who otherwise have none, as prelates, priests, and byshops. So that although the Pope derive religion, and chiefly direct in it, yet is the King the only head of all civil coercion, as well in Church affairs as any other, which his commands and laws do reach unto.

So that the line of Church government amongst catholiks, since the conversion of kings, runs in two streams; the one is of direction, the other of coercion. That of direction is from Christ to the chief pastour, from him to patriarchs, then to metropolitans, arch-bishops, bishops, priests, and people: and in this line is no corporal coercion at all, except it be borrowed; nor any other power to punish, but only by debarring men from sacraments. In the other line of corporal power and authority the King is immediately under God the Almighty, from whom he receiveth the sword to keep and defend

defend the distates of truth and justice, as supreme governour, though himself for direction and faith be subject to the Church from whose hands he received it, as well as other people his subjects; after the King succeed his princes and governours in order, with that portion of power all of them, which they have from him their leige sovereign received. This in brief of papal Church government, which we in *England* by our-canting talk of the Lord Christ, to the end we may be all lords and all Christs, have utterly subverted.

Indeed in primitive times the channel of religion for three hundred years ran apart, and separate from civil government which in those dayes persecuted it. And then the line of Christian government was unmixt. None but priests guided, defended, governed the Church and Christian flock; which they did by the power of their faith, vertue, secret strength, and courage in Jesus their Lord invisible. Afterward it pleased the God of mercies, to move the hearts of emperours and kings of the earth, to submit unto a participation of grace; which they were more easily inclined by the innocence and sanctity of Christian faith, especially in that particular of peaceful obedience unto kings and rulers, though aliens, and pagans, and persecutors of religion. And now kings being made Christian were looked upon by their subjects with a double

ble reverence, more loved, more feared, more honoured than before. Nor could Christian people now tell, how to expresse that ineffable respect they bore their Kings, now co-heirs of heaven, with them, whom before in their very paganism they were taught by their priests to observe as gods upon earth, not for wrath only or fear of punishment, but for conscience also, and danger of hazarding not only their temporal contents, but their eternal salvation also, for their resisting authority though resident in pagans. And Kings on the other side, who aforetime by the counsel of worldly senators enacted laws, such as they thought fit for present policy, and defended them by the sword of justice, wielden under God to the terror of evil doers and defence of the innocent, began now, as was incumbent on their duty, to use that sword for the protection of Christianity, and faith, and the better way now chalked out unto them by Christian priests, from Jesus the wisdom and Son of God. And by the direction of the same holy prelates, abbots, and other priests, who were now admitted with other senators into counsel, did they in all places enact speciall and particular laws answerable to the general rule of faith, which they found to be more excellent and perfect, than any judgment they had by natural reason hitherto discovered.

Thus

Thus poor Christians, who had hitherto but only a head of *derivation*, of counsel and direction, which could but only bid them have patience for Christs sake, and conform themselves to his meek passion, when they suffered from aliens, and when they suffered injury from one another, could only debar the evil doer, if he gave not satisfaction, from further use of sacraments; those Christians I say, who could hitherto have no other comfort or assistance in this world under their spiritual pastour, than what words of piety could afford, had now by the grace of heaven princely protectours, royal defenders, and head champions under God; to vindicate and make good all Christian rights, discipline, and truths now accepted and established from faith, as well as other civil rites and customs dictated aforetime from meer reason, equally revengers upon all evil doers indifferently; that were found criminal in affairs, as well purely Christian as civil, still using the advice and direction of their prelates and Christian peers in the framing and establishing of all those laws they were now resolved to maintain. So it was done in *England*; so in all places of the Christian world. And then the line of Christian government ran mixt, which before was single. And Christians now had a *Joshua* to their *Aaron*, who were only led by *Moyse* before. And although *Aaron* was head of the Church, yet

*Joshua* was head and leader, prince and captain of all those people who were of that Church. The chief byshop is an *Aaron*, and every Christian king a *Joshua*. And as it is a content and support to *Aaron* to have a *Joshua* with him, to fight Gods battles, and keep the people in awe; so is it not a little comfort to *Joshua* to have an *Aaron* by him, with whom he may consult. And indeed no kingdom can have a perfect accomplishment without the presence of these two swords, civil and spiritual. *Ecce duo gladij hic! satis est.*

And although Christians even at this day, when any heresy or novelty arises, have still recourse unto the same head of their religion for a decision of the doubt, whom they consulted before, (for as the channel of Christianity is and must be still the same, so must the spring-head be the same also) yet when the thing is once decided, they have none but kings and governours under him, to see the direction executed, as the only overseers with coactive power to do it.

And thus you see in brief how the Pope is head of the Church, and the King head likewise, and both immediately under God; but with this difference, that the king only governs Christianity established in his own royalty by law; the Pope without further law rules and guides all the streams and rivulets of religion, where ever it flows. He is head of primary direction; the king

king of sovereign execution: he of guidance and spiritual authority only; the king of civil and natural power invested in his place and dignity from God above, to maintain any laws as well purely Christian as civil, which himself shall accept, establish, and promulgate. The Pope persuades; but the King commands: and although the Pope should formally command, yet virtually and in effect such a command amounts only to a persuasion; and he that obeys not, feels no smart for it, except the king be pleased to espous his caus, and punish the contumacious; which if he justly do, then have kings a just authority in those affairs; if otherwise, then hath the Pope no means of help or defence in this world, any more after the conversion of kings than before it; and help himself he cannot any other way, than only by putting people out of his communion, who care not for it. The Pope is obeyed for conscience and love only to his religion; the King for wrath and conscience too: the Pope delivers the rule but in general only, and blunt on one side; the King particularises it, and gives it an edg: the Popes headship is exercised in *Ought and Should be*; the Kings is *Will and shall be*: the Pope directs, but the King compells: the Pope secludes the contumacious from heaven, which he that beleevs not feels not; the King over and above that, cuts off malefactors



from the face of the earth too, and they shall be made by feeling to beleev it.

And these two defend and secure one another, and keep both Christians and their faith inviolate. And while Christians themselves do both tenderly love their Pape and chief pastour, and spring-head of their religion, which is beleevd beyond him to flow invisibly from God the great ocean of truth; and withall do honor fear, and observ their King and princely governor, who only bears the sword of justice, and not in vain, to take revenge upon all those, whom the love of religion and spiritual sword of their pastour will not keep in awe, they do their duty as they ought, and shall finde happines therein. I must make haste, and can say no more at present to this busines, which as I have told you is somewhat besides my purpos.

Only one thing I must needs tell you before I pass on. Although a King is in a good and proper sence stiled head as well of Church as State within his own dominions, as for all coercive power therein; yet head of the Church *absolutely*, or head of primary direction in faith, is so proper to the chief Prelate, that no man upon earth besides himself hath ever so much as pretended to it: and that for five reasons. First, becaus *head of the Church absolutely*, intimates an universal right over the guidance of religion, not in one kingdom only, but all, where ever  
that

that religion is. And the King of *France*, for example, neither did nor can pretend to be head of the Church of *England*, much less of *Hungary, Spain, Africk, Italy, Greece, Asia, &c.* Yet such a head there must needs be, to the end the Church may be one mystick body, at unity in it self. And that head must be unlimited to time and place, as the Church it self is ever permanent, and universally spread; nor must the government alter, as governments of particular kingdoms do. Secondly, head of the Church absolutely, involves a primacy both of conveying and interpreting faith: and all princes in *Europe* received their faith at first from priests, who sent for that end from their spiritual superior converted their kingdoms; but they never gave faith either to them or their pastour. Thirdly, he that is head of the Church absolutely, must be of the same connatural condition with the whole hierarchy, to confirm, baptise, ordain, preach, attone the almighty by sacrifice, impose hands, segregate men from their worldly state unto his own spiritual one, and in a special manner to exercise those priestly functions, unto which he segregates them. Fourthly, head of the Church absolutely is to be indifferent unto kingdoms and all sorts of government, as the religion also is, and keep it like it self in all places unaltered in its nature, however in its general dictates it may concur to

the direction and good of all people and governments. And therefor he cannot be confined to one place or government, but must be as it were separate and in a condition indifferent to all; as a general byshop, whose sole care is to heed those emanations of faith spread up and down the world, may be and is; when princes heed but their own particular kingdoms, and care not how religion goes in another, any more then their wealth or polity. Thus the sun-beams, though they fall upon several soils diversly affected, yet they keep their own nature unaltered, by vertue of one general fountain-head of light which is indifferent to every kingdom, and dispenses, distributes, and keeps the raies unchanged. The ends and wayes of religion are quite of another nature from all worldly businesses, and therfor require a particular superintendent set apart for them; as indeed they ever have had since the time of religions first master, who as he did educate his in order to a life eternal in a government apart, being himself a man distinct from *Cesar*, so used he to speak of religious duties as separate and differing from others; *Reddite, saith he, quæ Cesaris sunt, Cesari, & quæ Dei, Deo*. In very truth, the Church and Christianity, as it is a thing accidental to all worldly states, so is it superinduced upon them as an influence of another rank and order, unto a particular end of future

future blifs; whereas all states do of themselves aim no further then the peace and happines of this life. And so for the particular end and means answerable ther into, which religion uses, it will require a particular and special overseer. Thus *Aristotle*, though he conceited the celestial orbs to be contiguous, and so all rapt together in a motion from East to West, yet because they had special motions of their own, he therefore allowed them particular intelligences to guide those motions. So we see in ordinary affairs, a man that hath several wayes and ends is guided by several directours, in this by a lawyer, in that by a physician, by a gardener, by a tradesman, &c. Fifthly, because head of the Church absolutely must be one that succeeds in his chair, whom Jesus the master left and appointed personally to feed his flock. No King upon earth ever pretended to sit in that Fishermans chair, or to succeed him in it, which the Pope to my knowledg for sixteen hundred years hath both challenged as his right, and actually possesseth. And Catholiks are all so fixt in this judgment, that they can no more disbeleeve it, then they can ceas to beleeve in Jesus Christ.

*11 ch. from page 228. to 246.*

Your eleventh chapter falls directly upon my fifteenth paragraft of Scriptur. And therefore I may here expect, you should insult over me to the purpos. But Sir I told you before, and now

tell you again, that I know no other rule to Christians either for faith or manners, no other hope, no other comfort, but what scriptur and holy gospel affords. But this is not any part of the debate now in hand, however you would perswade the world to think so. When four or five men Sir of several judgements collected from the very scriptur you and I talk of, rise up one against another with one and the same scriptur in their hands, with such equal pretence of light, power, and reason, that no one will either yield to another, or remain himself in the same faith, but run endles divisions without controul: does scriptur prevent this evil? does it, has it, can it remedy it? can any one man make a religion by the authority of scriptur alone, which neither himself nor any other, upon the same grounds he framed it, shall rationally doubt of. This is our case Sir, and only this, which you do not so much as take notice of, to the end you may with a more plausible rhetorick, insult over me as a contemner of Gods word. Nor do you heed any particle of my discours in this paragraph, but according to your manner, collect principles to the number of seven, out of it, you say, which I do not know to be so much as hinted in it; that as you did before, so you may now again play with your own bawble, and confute your self. And they are in a manner the very same you sported with before in your  
second

second chapter. 1. *from the Romans we received the gospel.* 2. *what is spoken in scripture of the Church, belongs to the Roman.* 3. *the Roman every way the same it was, &c.* of all which I do not remember that I have in that my paragraff so much as any one word. Sir, either speak to my discours as you finde it, or els hold your peace.

As if then you had overheard me afore-hand, to give you this deserved check, at the close of your chapter, you bring in som few words of mine, with a short answer of your own, annex to the skirts of it; which I here set down as you place them your self. No man can say, speaks *Fiat Lux*, what ill popery ever did in the world, till *Henry* the eight's dayes, when it was first rejected. *Strange*, say you in your Animadversions, *when it did all the evils that ever were in the Christian world.* With the Roman catholiks unity ever dwelt. *Never.* Protestants know their neighbour catholiks, not their religion. *They know both.* Protestants are beholding to Catholiks, for their benefices, books, pulpits, gospel. *For som, not all.* The Pope was once beleev'd general pastour over all. *Prove it.* The scriptur and gospel we had from the Pope. *Not at all.* You cannot beleeve the scriptur, but upon the authority of the Church. *We can and do.* You count them who brought the scriptur as lyars. *No otherwise.* The gospel separated from  
the

the Church can prove nothing. *Yes it self.* This short work you make with me. And to all that serious discours of mine concerning scriptur, which takes up sixteen pages in *Fiat Lux*, we have got now in reply thereunto, this your Laconick-confutation. *Strang. Never. Know both. Som not all. Prove it. Not at all. Can and do. No otherwis. Yes it self.*

12 ch. from page 246. to 262.

Your twelfth chapter meets with my history of religion, as a flint with steel, only to strike fire. For not heeding my story which is serious, temperate, and sober, you tell another of your own, fraught with defamations and wrath, against all ages and people: and yet speak as confidently, as calm truth could do. First you say, that *Joseph of Arimathea was in England, but he taught the same religion that is in England now.* But what religion is that Sir? Then, you tell us that the story of *Fugatus and Damian missionaries of Pope Eleutherius* you do suspect for many reasons. But becaus you assign none, I am therfor moved to think they may be all reduced to one, which is, that you will not acknowledg any good thing ever to have come from Rome: Then, say you, *succceeded times of luxury, sloth, pride, ambition, scandalous riots, and corruption both of faith and manners, over all the Christian world, both princes, priests, prelates and people.* Not a grain of vertue or any goodnes we must think,



think, in so many Christian kingdoms and ages. Then did Goths and Vandals, and other pagans overflow the Christian world. To teach them we may think, how to mend their manners. These pagans took at last to Christianity. Haply, because it was a more loose and wicked life, than their own pagan profession. These men now Christened advanced the Popes authority, when Christian religion was now grown degenerate. And now we come to know, how the Roman byshop became a patriarch above the rest, by means namely of new converted pagans. It was an odde chance, they should think of advancing him to what they never knew, either himself, or any other advanced before amongst Christians, whose rotten and corrupt faith they had lately embraced. And yet more odde and strange it was, that all Christendom should calmly submit to a power, set up anew by young converted pagans; no prince or byshop either there or of any other Christian Kingdom, either then or ever after to this day excepting against it. Had not all the byshops and priests of Africa, Egypt, Syria, Thrace, Greece, and all the Christian world acknowledged by a hundred experiments the supreme spiritual authority of the Roman patriarch in all times, before this deluge of Goths and Vandals? But why do I expostulate with you, who write these things not to judicious readers, but fools and children, who are not more apt to tell

a truth, then beleev a ly. But what follows next. *Towards the beginning of this lurry, say you, were the Brittons extirpated by the Saxes, who in after-times received Austin from Rome, a man very little acquainted with the Gospel.* Here's the thanks good S. Austin hath, who out of his love and tendernes to our nations welfare, after so long and tedious journeys, entred upon the wild Forrest of our paganisme, with great hazards and inexpressible sufferings of hunger, cold, and other corporal inconveniences, to communicate Christ Jesus, and his life and grace unto our nation. *After this, say you, religion daily more and more declined till the Reformation rose.* This is the sum of your story; which if I like not, I may thank myself, say you, for putting you in minde of it. Indeed Sir, it is so fals and defamatory, and loaden with foul language, not only against all nations, ages and people of all conditions, but against the honour of sacred gospel it self, which must utterly dye, and have no life or power in the world for so many ages together, that I think neither I, or any els can like it, that bears any respect either to religion, modesty, or truth. You say in this your chapter that *I am better at telling a tale then mannaging an argument:* But I shall now beleev, that you are equally good at both. Popery then is nothing but vice, and Protestancy is all vertue. I would we could see where this Protestancy dwells.

13 ch. from page 262. to 278.

Your thirteenth chapter takes up my three following paragraffs about the *history of religion*; wherein, after that according to your wonted manner you tell me, that I *do not my self understand* what this thing, that thing, the other thing means, altho it be part of my own discours, you say at length, that *ther is no such matter*, as I speak; make another story of your own of the same mettle with your former, imposing afresh upon popery (by which I do not indeed know what you mean) a wain-load of adulteries, drunkennes, atheisme, poisonings, avarice, pride, cruelties, tumults, blasphemy, rebellions, wars, crimes, and yet threatning to say, if you should chance to be provoked, far harder things then these. Sir, may no man provoke a wasp, nor force you to your harder things. You are a terrible man of arms.

But if this be the right character of *Popery*, which here and elsewhere up and down your book you give us, I tell you first, it will be a difficult matter to know in what age or place *popery* most reigns; secondly, that it is a thing I am so far from excusing, that I wish it back to the pit of hell from whence it issued; thirdly, that Roman catholiks, if you be indeed against this popery, are all on your side; for to my knowledg their religion is as opposite to it, as light to darknes, or God to Belial; lastly, that  
you

you need not be so tenderly fearful for the spreading of *popery*; for honest men will be ready to stone him that teaches it; and knaves, hypocrites, adulterers, traitors, thieves, drunkards, atheists, rebels, if you have given a right description of *popery*, are all Papists already; these need no conversion, the other will by no rhetorick be moved to it. Indeed you fright us all from papistry. For though some love iniquity as it is gainful or pleasurable, and must needs suffer for it when they are condemned at the sessions, and cannot avoid it; yet is no man willing to suffer either loss of goods or imprisonment, death or banishment, for the bare name of *popery*, that hath neither good nor gain in it. In a word, wicked men will act your *popery*, but not own it. And they which own a *popery*, which I see you are not acquainted withall, will not only dislike others, but hate themselves, if through any frailty or passion they should ever fall into any article of your *Popery* here described. Good Sir, take heed of blaspheming that innocent Catholick flock, which the Angels of God watch over to protect them. Be afraid to curse them, whom God hath blessed, or impose that upon their Religion, which it detests.

14 ch. from page 278. to 286.

Your fourteenth chapter, which is upon my title of *Discovery*, labours to show that some of the

the *contradictions*, which I mentioned in *Fiat Lux* to be put upon popery, are no *contradictions* at all; and labour may. Well Sir, although *slanders* put upon them be never so *contradictory* and *opposite*, yet must they have patience. All is true enough, if it be but bad enough. While our Kings reign in peace, then the Papists religion is persecuted, as contrary to monarchy: when we have destroyed that government, then is the papist harassed, spoiled, pillaged, murdered, because their religion is wholly addicted to monarchy, and papists are all for Kings. Have not these things been done over and over, within the space of a few years here lately in *England*? All men now alive have been eye-witnesses of it. These things as put upon papists cease to be contradictions: And if they should be contradictions, both parts are therefore true in our country logic, because they are put upon papists. Is there not something of the power of darkness in this?

One latin word of mine which shuts up that my paragraph of *Discovery*. *Ejice ancillam cum puero suo*, because I english it not, you translate it for me, or rather interpret it, *Bannish all men out of England but Papists*: this according to your gloss must be my meaning. And you seem to exult, that *Fiat Lux*, who in outward show pretends so much moderation, should let fall a word that betrayes no little mischief in his heart.

heart. Good Lord whither does passion hurry mans spirit ! All that period of mine in the end of the foresaid § is but meerly coppied out of one of Saint *Pauls* letters, which he wrote to the *Galatians*, the fourth chapter of that Epistle, wherein those very words, alluding to a passage in *Moses* his pentateuch, are exprest. Do you either read in your English Bible, *Banish all men out of England*, or understand any such meaning of *Ejice antillam cum puero suo?* Gal. 4. 30. Pray peruse the ten last verses of that chapter attentively ; and see if I have not in my discours so coppied out their meaning and very words too, so far as it behooved ; that I have done nothing els. *Abraham* had two sons, saith St. *Paul*, one of a handmaid, the other of a free woman, &c. These things are an allegory, &c. But as then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. But what saith the scriptur ? Cast out the bondwoman with her son : for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman, &c. Pray tell me soberly ; Did the apostle mean by those words, Cast out the Bondwoman with her son, that the sons of *Ishmael* should be put to the sword, or banisht out of their kingdom ? Now pray hear my discours which I coppied out of that original ; If my reader here be cautious, he may easily discern a reason, why all these sects are so loisterous one against another, and every

every one of them against the Roman catholik. Ismael disturbed the whole how, and was ever quarrelling and bustling against Isaac. The reason is the same both here and there. Ismael was a natural son, and Isaac the legitimate heir. And natural sons be generally seditious, violent and clamorous. As Ismael therfor was Isaac his natural brother; so is a Protestant Minister but the by-blow of a catholick Priest; the Presbyterian likewise to him: and so forward, till you com to the Quaker, who was begot by a delusion, and brought into the world by a fright: his hand is against every man, and every mans hand against him. The remedy and only means of peace is, *Ejice ancillam cum puero suo*. These be my words out of *S. Paul*; and what is his meaning, the same is mine. But you will have me in spight of my teeth, becaus I speak nothing but good, still to mean som evil. I thought *S. Paul* had meant by those words, if I must needs discover my understanding to you, that the peaceable *Isaacs* were the only sons of Gods promised love and favour, the inheritance of which blessing boisterous *Ismaels* can never work out to themselves, by all their persecutions and bustling contentions. And according to this meaning I concluded, that to consider and think seriously of this, were the only remedy and means of peace amongst us here in England. *Ejice ancillam cum puero suo* is an antidote against all contentious emulations, which are a suspicious



mark not of an elect, but of a reprobate. But whatever I say, I must neither think, nor mean, but what you will have me to do; and that shall still be something that is odious. An emblem hereof was the rod of *Moses*, which in *Moses* hand was a walking-staff, but out of it a serpent.

15 ch. from page 286 to 304.

In your fifteenth chapter, upon my paragraft of *Messach*, you are in a mighty plunge what this *Messach* should be, and what the *etimology* of that word. *Latin* it is not, *greek* it is not, and you are sure it is not *hebrew*; surely it is, say you, *some uncouth word, like that of the Gnosticks Paldabaoth*. Alas good Sir, it is English, a pure English word; used here in *England* all the Saxons time, and som hundred years after the conquest, till the French monosyllable had by little and little worn out the last syllable of the word. And you may find it yet in the old *Saxon* laws which I have read my self, those especially of King *Ina*, if I rightly remember the name, which be yet extant, wherein strict care and provision is made, that a due reverence be kept by all people in the Church all the time of their *Messach*, which now we call *Mess* or *Mass*.

Then having laughed at my admiration of catholik Service, you carp at me for saying that the first *Christians* were never called together to hear a sermon; and to convince me, you bring  
som

some places out of *S. Pauls Epistles*, and the *Acts*, which commend the ministry of the word: This indeed is your usual way of refuting my speeches; you flourish copiously in that which is not at all against me, and never apply it to my words, lest it should appear, as it is, impertinent. I deny not that people were by Gods word converted, or that converts were further instructed, or that the preaching of Gods word is good and useful many wayes; but that which I say is, that primitive Christians were never called together for that end, as the great work of their Christianity. This I have so clearly proved, both in the second dialogue of the *Reclaimed Papist*, and also in the foresaid paragraff of *Messach*, that you divert from that, to declaim of the necessity and excellency of preaching, and bring neither text nor reason that may reach to my words at all.

You go on; and wonder much, that we should hear nothing in scriptur of this Christian sacrifice, if any such were. Sir, you will neither hear nor see. But, say you, the passion of our Lord is our Christian sacrifice. Do not I say so too? But that this inruent sacrifice was instituted by the same Lord before his death, to figur out daily before our eyes that passion of his, which was then approaching, in commemoration of his death, so long as the world should last; this, as I plainly speak it, you take no notice of it.

But the Judaical sacrifice, say you, is said by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews, in this to differ from the sacrifice of Christians, that ours was don but once, theirs often. It is true, the sacrifice of our Lords passion, of which the apostle in that whole discours only treats, in opposition to that of bulls and goats, was so don but once, that it could not be don twice. But as the sacrifices of the old law, were instituted by almighty God, to be often iterated before the passion of the Messias for a continual exercise of religion; so did the same Lord for the very same purpos of religious exercise, institute another to be iterated after his death; unto which it were to have reference, when it should be past, as the former had to the same death, when it was to com. And it hath a reference so much the more excellent, as that it doth by the almighty power of the same Messias, exhibit to the faith of his beleivers, that very true real body as crucified amongst us, wherof the former Mosaical sacrifices gave meerly a shadow. Did not our Lord do this? Were not the apostles according to this rite *ἀνταρρύπτεις τῷ κυρίῳ*, sacrificing to our great Lord God, when S. Paul was by imposition of hands segregated from the laity for his divine service, as I clearly in that my paragress evince out of the history of the Acts of the apostles. No, say you, the apostles were not then about any sacrifice, but only preach-

preaching Gods word, or som such thing to the people, in the name and behalf of God. But Sir, is this to be in earnest or to jest? The sacred text sayes, they were sacrificing to our Lord, liturgyng, and ministring to him. You say, *They were not sacrificing to God, but only preaching to the people.* And now the question is, whether you or I more rightly understand that Apostolicall book, For my sence and meaning I have all antiquity, as well as the plain words of sacred text, you have neither.

16. ch. from page 304 to 313.

Your sixteenth chapter upon my paragraft of the Virgin Mary, which is, you say, *the most disingenious of all my book,* is spent in an *invective against calumnies*, which brings you upon your often iterated common place of *Pagans reproaches of Christians.* And whatever my paragraft may be, this your chapter seems to me as ingenious as the very best of your book, and absolutely frivolous. And must you invegh against calumnies, whose whole book is nothing els? It is a bundle of slanders, and a meer quiver of fiery darts of desolation and malice.

17. ch. from page 313 to 325.

Your seventeenth chapter upon my paragraft of *Images or Figures*, nibbles at more of my discours made in that one paragraft, then you have taken notice of in ten of my others. A

man, say you, may indeed have such thoughts of devotion, as *Fiat Lux* speaks of, upon the sight of images, which he sees hanging in Churches, if he be a man distraught of his wits; not if he be himself and sober. So then; mad men it seems can tell what figures represent, sober and wise men cannot. Again, The violation of an image, say you, redounds to the prototype, if it be rightly and duly represented, not els. And when then is Christ crucified, for example, rightly and duly represented? Are you one of those mad men can tell what figures represent, yea or no. The hanging up of traitors in effigie is don, say you, only to make a declaration of the fact, and not to cast a dishonour upon the person. So you say: Because you know it don long after the fact has rung all the whole Kingdom over; and don, not in places of concours, but ignominy; not in the Exchange, but Tyburn; not with any characters declaring the fact, but with a halter about his neck, to denote the death and ignominy inflicted, as far as is possible, upon him. You go on.

Where the Psalmist complains of Gods enemies breaking down his sculptures, he means not that by any images or figures, but only wainscot or carved ceiling. Surely the Prophet wanted a word then to express himself, or translatours to express the Prophet. If we must guess at his meaning without heeding his words, one might think

think it as probable, what also holy scripture tells us, that the hous of God was ordained with sculptures of *Cherubims*, and other angels, to represent his true hous that is above; as with the circles, quadrats, triangel, rhombos, and rhomboides of wainscot. *The eye*, say you again, *may not have her species as well as the ear, becaus God has commanded the one and not the other.* This Sir you only say. *Fiat Lux* makes it appear, that God commands and commends both, and the nature of man requires both: nor can you give any reason, why I may not look upon him who was crucified, as well as hear of him. You adde. *Nor is the sole end of preaching as Fiat Lux would have it, only to move the mind of the hearers unto corresponding affections.* Why do not you say then, what els it is for? you deny my words, but declare your self no other end, but what I have in those short words exprest. You may haply conceal in your heart som other end of your preaching, which you are loath to speak; as to procure applaus, to vent your rhetorick, to get good benefices, to show your fine cloth and silks, your pure neat white starched bands and cuffs, button'd handkerchiefs and ladies gloves, to inflame factions, get wives, or the like; but I could not think of all things at once; nor needed I to express any more, then that one end of preaching which is connatural, apostolical, and legal. You go on.

God indeed commanded the Cherubims to be set upon the ark, but those cherubims were images of nothing; of what should they be images? Nor were they set up to be adored. Besides God who commanded them to be set up, did no more gainsay his own prohibition of images to be made, than he contradicted his own rule which forbids to steal, when he commanded his people to spoil the Egyptians. But Sir, since the real Cherubims are not made of our beaten gold, those set up by Moses must be only figures. And of what els should they be figures but of those real ones. Nor is it either to my purpos or yours, that they are set up to be adored. For images in catholick Churches, are not set up for any such purpos; nor do I any where say it. No man alive has any such thought, nor tradition, no council hath delivered it, no practis infers it. Christian Philosophers or Schoolmen have indeed raised a philosophical question; *Whether any respect may be terminated upon the figure*, purely as it such an absolute entity in it self, besides that relative one that falls only upon the prototype: But what they question, or what they talk, or what they resolve, does no more belong, becaus they say it, unto catholik faith, then if they had been asleep and said nothing. All catholik councils and practis declares such sacred figures, to be expedient assistants to our thoughts in our divine meditation and prayers: and that is all that



I know of it. And the relative respect that is given to any figur as it is such a figur, whether in a glass, or in any more fixed postur to supply the defects of a mirrour, that it terminates naturally upon the sampler. or prototype is evident to right reason and philosophy. And it cannot be otherwise.

That which you speak of the Israelites spoiling the Egyptians by Gods command, hath some species of an argument in it. But Sir, we must know, you as well as I, that God who forbids men to steal, did not then command to steal, as you say he did, when he had his people spoil the Egyptians under the species of a loan. Many things legitimate that their act of spoil, and clear it from any notion of theft or robbery or stealing. First, they might have of themselves a right to those few goods, in satisfaction of the long oppression they had unjustly undergon: and it may be that in that their great haste, their own allowance was not then paid them. But secondly, becaus it is a thing of danger, that any servant should be allowed to right himself, by putting his hand to his masters goods, though his case of wrong be never so clear, therfor did the command of God intervene to justify their action. And the absolute dominion of the whole earth and all that is in it, being inseparably in the hands of God, made that by Gods expresse command to be truly now and justly the Hebrews

Hebrews right, which by an inferiour and subordinate title, such as is in the hand of creatures, belonged to the Egyptians before. So that the Hebrews in taking those goods with them, did not steal: nor did God command them to steal, when he had them carry those goods of the Egyptians with them; for that upon that very command of God they now ceased to be the Egyptians any more. But this can no wayes be applied to the busines of *Images*: nor could God command the Hebrews to make any images, if he had absolutely forbidden to have any at all made. For this concerns not any affair between neighbour and neighbour, whereof the supreme Lord hath absolute dominion, but the service only and adoration due from man to his maker, which God being essentially good and immutably true, cannot alter or dispens with. Nor doth it stand with his natur and deity to chang, dispens, or vary the first table of his law concerning himself; I mean as to the substance of it, by commanding us now to have but one God, then to worship two; now not to take his name in vain, and then to blaspheme it, as he may do the second, which concerns neighbours; for want of that dominion over himself, which he hath over any creature, to give or take away its right, to preserv or destroy it, as himself pleases. God may disable my neighbours right, and inable me to  
take

take to my self that which before was his, but he cannot command me to commit idolatry or dishonour himself. If he should deny himself, he would not be God. From hence it must needs follow, that if it be the sens and mind of the almighty, that to set up any images in Churches be derogatory to his glory, then could not God possibly command any to be there set up. For these two precepts, *Thou shalt set up images*, and *Thou shalt set up none*, are not only contradictory in terms of the law proposed, enounced and promulgated, but infer also in God himself that contradiction, opposition and self-denial, which is inconsistent with such an unchangeable veracity. God may possibly allow me either to curse or spoil my neighbour, or in a case exprest not to help him; but he should deny himself, (which the deity cannot do) if either he should command me to blaspheme himself, or the honour due to him either to refuse it him, or give it to another. When therfor one and the same God so often forbids his people to make to *themselves* any images; and yet in the same divine law commands them to set up Cherubims in his own temple; it cannot, being a concernment of his worship, be otherwayes meant, than that they should make no sculptures or figures, but what himself commands; and which may assuredly represent persons dear to himself, as *Fiat Lux* interprets it.

And

And if an image in it self be opposite to Gods glory, as Anticatholiks think; then could not God possibly command the making or setting up of any, in his holy temple or place of divine worship. But you go on.

*Fiat Lux* sayes, God forbad forreign images, such as Moloch, Dagon, and Astaroth, but he commanded his own. But *Fiat lux* is deceived in this as well as other things, for God forbad any likenesses of himself; and he gives the reason, because, saith he, in Horeb ye saw no similitude of me. Sir, you may know and consider, that the statues and graven images of the heathens, towards whose land Israel then in the wilderness was journeying, to enter and take possession, were ever made by the pagans to represent God, and not any devils, although they were deluded in it. And therfor were they called the gods of the mountains, the gods of the valleys, the gods of Accaron, Moab, &c. Ther was therfor good reason, that the Hebrews, who should be cautioned from such snares, should be forbidden to make to *themselves* any similitude or likenes of God. What figur or similitude the true God had allowed his people, that let them hold and use, until the fulness of time should com, when the figur of his substance, the splendour of his glory, and only image of his natur should appear. And now good Sir, since God has been pleased to show us his face, pray give Christians leav to use,

use, and keep, and honour it: If you be otherwise minded, and take pleasur in defacing his figures, I think they have good reason on their sides, who honour them. You proceed.

*It is a pretty fanfj in Fiat Lux, to say we have as well a precept, Thou shalt make graven images, as we have, Thou shalt not. I wonder where Fiat Lux finds that precept, sith all ancients have it, and all translations read it, Thou shalt not. What is that It they have, what is that It they read? Do you think that Fiat lux reads one and the same text, both Thou shalt and Thou shalt not. Moses his making, and the command given him to make Cherubims, is a rule good enough to Fiat lux, that som images may be made, and set up in Churches: as also is that precept, Thou shalt not make to thy self any images, another rule to show him, that som images we are not to make to our selves on our own heads, in imitation of pagans.*

*No less whimsical, say you, is that relation Fiat lux sayes an image hath to som one Prototype, for example, to S. Peter rather then to Simon Magus: for ther can be no relation, but what the imagination either of the framer or spectatour makes. Sir, speaking as I do of a formal representation or relation, and not of the efficient caus of it, I cannot but wonder at this your illogical asser-tion. Is the pictur made by the spectatours imagination to represent this or that thing? or the ima-*

imagination rather guided to it by the picture? By this rule of yours the image of *Caesar*, did not my imagination help it, would no more represent a man than a mouse. I know the imagination can, for want of real pictures, make fantastical ones to its self; in the clouds, walls, air, or fire, &c. But when she hath real ones, made her either by art or nature, she cannot make them to be otherways than they are; nor think or say, except she will abuse her self to derision, that a cat is a dog, or an ox a hare. Nor does it help you at all, that there may be mistakes; for we treat not here of the errors but natures of things. And you will not I hope maintain, that there is no real heat any where, but what the imagination makes, because the good poor man of *Norway* sent out of his own country upon an errand, stood warming his fingers there, at a hedge of red roses.

18 ch. from page 325. to 365.

Your eighteenth chapter, which is upon my paragraft of *Tongues* or *Latin service*, hath some colour of plausibility. But because you neither do, nor will understand the customs of that Church, which you are eager to oppose; all your words are but wind. I have heard many grave protestant divines, ingeniously acknowledge, that divine comfort and sanctity of life requisite to salvation which religion aims at, may with more perfection and less inconvenience

ence be attained by the customs of the Roman Church, which gives the sense, life, and meaning of Gods word to the people, without the hard shell of the letter, than that of ours, which gives it in the shell to break peoples teeth. Religion is not to sit pierching upon the lips, but to be got by heart, it consists not in reading but doing; and in this, not in that, lives the substance of it, which is soon and easily conveyed. Christ our Lord drew a compendium of all divine truths into two words, which his great apostle again abridged into one. And if the several gospels for every day in the year, which are or may be in the hands of all catholiks, the chiefeft particles of divine epistles, books of sacred history and meditation upon all the mysteries of salvation, and spiritual treatises for all occasions and uses, which be numberles amongst catholiks, adjoynd to the many several rites of examination of conscience, daily and continual practis of prayer and fasting, and an orderly commemoration of the things God hath wrought for us throughout the year, which all by law are tied to observ, and do observ them, may not give a sufficient acquaintance of what concerns our salvation, and promote them enough towards it, I am to seek what it is that can; or what further good it may do, to read the letter of Saint *Pauls* epistles, to the *Romans* for example, or *Corinthians*, wherin questions,  
and



and cases and theological discourses are treated, that vulgar people can neither understand, nor are at all concerned to know. And I pray you tell me ingeniously, and without heat, what more of good could accrew to any by the translated letter of a book, whereof I will be bold to say, that nine parts in ten concern not my particular, either to know or practise, than by the conceived substance of Gods will to me, and my own duty towards him? or what is there now here in *England* when the letter of scripture is set open to every mans eye, any more either of peace or charity, piety or justice, than in former catholik times, when the substance of Gods word and will was given people in short, and the observance of their duty prolixly preſt upon them. What did they do in those ancient catholik times? they flockt every day in the week to their Churches, which stood continually open, there to pray and meditate, and renew their good purposes; they sung psalms, hymns, and canticles all over the land both day and night; they built all our churches, that we have at this day remaining amongst us, and as many more, which we have razed and pulled down; they founded our universities, established our laws, set out tythes and glebe-land for their clergy, built hospitals, erected corporations; in a word, did all the good things we found done for our good in this our native kingdom. But  
now,

*Quid agitur in Anglia? Consultitur de religione.*

The former Christians practised, and we dispute: they had a religion, we are still seeking one: they exercised themselves in good works by the guidance of their holy catholik faith which leads to them; all these works we by our faith evacuate as menstruous rags: they had the substance of true religion in their hearts; we the text in our lips: they had nothing to do but to conform their lives to Gods will; all our endeavour is to apply Gods word to our own factions. Sir mistake me not: The question between us, is not, *Whether the people are to have Gods word, or no?* but whether that word consists in the letter left to the peoples disposal; or in the substance urgently imposed upon people for their practise. And this because you understand not, but mistake the whole business, all your talk in this your eighteenth chapter vades into nothing.

Where *Fiat Lux* sayes in that forenamed paragraph, that the *Pentateuch* or *hagiograph* was never by any High-priest among the Jews turned into a vulgar tongue, nor the *Gospel* or *Liturgy* out of greek in the Eastern part of the Christian Church, or latin in the Western: You slight this discours of mine, because hebrew, greek, and latin was, say you, vulgar tongues themselves. I know this well enough. But when and how long ago were they so? not for some

hundreds of years to my knowledge. And was the Bible, Psalms, or Christian liturgy then put into vulgar tongues, when those they were first writ in, ceased to be vulgar? This you should have spoke to, if you had meant to say any thing, or gain-say me. Nor is it to purpos, to tell me that *S. Jerome* translated the Bible into *Dalmatian*; I know well enough it has been so translated by some special persons into *Gothish*, *Armenian*, *Ethiopian*, and other particular dialects. But did the Church either of the Hebrews or Christians, either greek or latin, ever deliver it so translated to the generality of people, or use it in their service, or command it so to be don, as a thing of general concernment and necessity? So far is it from this, that they would never permit it. This I said, and I first said it, before you spoke, and your meer gain-say without further reason or probability of proof cannot disposses me.

*Dr. Cousins*, now byshop of *Durham*, lately sojourneying in *Paris*, when he understood of a grecian byshops arrival there, did with some other English Gentlemen in his company give him a visit, and with the same or like company went afterwards to see him. The articles of our English Church were translated into greek, and shown him. Many questious were asked him about the service of the grecian Church, praying for the dead, invocation of Saints, real pre-

presence, confession, &c. Dr. Cousins can tell himself what answer he received from that venerable grave prelate *Cyrril*, archbishop of *Trapezond*; for that was his name and title. In brief, he owned not those articles, as any way consonant to the faith of the Greeks, who believed and had ever practised the contrary. He also told them distinctly and openly, that *Mass* or *Liturgy* was, and had ever been the great work of their Christianity all over the greek Church; that confession of sins to a priest, praying for the dead, invocation of saints, and such like points wherein we in *England* differ from papists, were all great parts of their religion, and their constant practis. Finally, he let them know, that all the Liturgies, both those of *St. Basil*, *St. Chrysostom*, *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, were ever kept in the learned greek, differing from the vulgar language. And withall showed his own greek book of *Liturgy*, which he used himself at the altar. Dr. Cousins did himself see him officiate with his lay-brother a monk of *St. Basil*, belonging to *St. Catherins* monastery in mount *Sima*, ministering to him at the altar; and found both by his words and practis, that in all those and other essential parts and observances of Christianity the Greeks agreed perfectly with the Roman Church. This testimony, Sir, of a venerable arch-bishop, to such a worthy person as Dr. Cousins, might I

should think suffice to justifie my words, and make you beleeve with me, that Christian Liturgies have ever been used, as *Fiat Lux* speaks in a learned language distinct from the vulgar. But we need not go far from home for a testimony. Neither the Bible nor Service-book was ever seen here in *England* for a thousand years space in any other language but Latin, before *Edward* the sixth dayes, (except haply the Psalter, which the Saxons and almost all people, have ever had in their own tongue, being a chief part of Christians devotion) nor in Brittish or Welch, before the byshop of *S. Asaphs* translation. And yet the people all that while wanted no knowledge of Gods will, or comfort of his word.

You mightily insult over me in your 336 page, for saying, that the *bible was kept by the Hebrews in an ark or tabernacle*, not touched by the people, but brought out at times to the priest, that he might instruct the people out of it. Here, say you, the *authour of Fiat Lux betrays his gross ignorance and something more: for the ark was placed in sanctum sanctorum*, and not entered but by the priest only once a year, whereas the people were weekly instructed. But Sir, do I speak there of any *sanctum sanctorum*, or of any ark in that place? Was ther, or could ther be no more arks but one? If you had been only in these latter dayes, in any synagogue or conven-

vention of Jews, you might have seen even now how the bible is kept still with them in an ark or tabernacle, in imitation of their fore-fathers, when they have now no *sanctum sanctorum* amongst them. You may also discern, how according to their custom, they cringe and prostrate at the bringing out of the bible, which is the only solemn adoration left amongst them; and that there be more arks than that in *sanctum sanctorum*. If I had called it a *box* or *chest* or *cupboard*, you had let it pass. But I used the word *Ark* as more sacred.

19 ch. from page 365 to 386.

I discerned in your nineteenth chapter, which is upon my paragraft of *Communion in one kind*, a somewhat more than ordinary swelling choller; which moved me to look over that my paragraft afresh. And I found my fault: there is in it so much of Christian reason and sobriety, that if I had since the time I first wrote it, swerved from my former judgment, of the probability I conceived to be in that Roman practis of communicating in one kind, I had there met with enough to convert my self. And therfor wondered no more, that you should load me so heavily with your wonted imputations of fraud, ignorance, blasphemy, and the like. I ever perceiv you to be then most of all passionate, when you meet with most convincing reasons. When the exorcist is most innocent, his patient, they say,

then frets and foams and curses most. Ther is not a word in this your chapter, which is not by way of anticipation answered in that my *¶* of *Fiat Lux*, against which you write.

20 ch. from page 386. to 402.

Ther is in your twentieth chapter, which prosecutes my paragraff of *Saints* or *Hero's*, one word of yours, that requires my notice. I say in that my paragraff, that the pagans derided the ancient Christians for three of their usages. First, for *eating their own God*: Secondly, for *kneeling to the Priests genitals*: Thirdly, for *worshipping an asses head*. This last you except against, and impute my story to my own simplicity and ignorance, if not to something worse; for that imputation, say you, was not laid upon Christians at all, but only upon Jews, as may be seen in *Josephus*, &c. but Sir, you may know, that in odious the primitive Christians were ever numbred among the Jews; and what evil report lay upon these, was charged also upon them, though sometimes upon another ground. And although *Josephus* may excuse the Jews, and not the Christians; yet a long while after his time, if not even then also, that slander was generally all over the pagan world charged upon Christians also, as may be read in *Tertullian*, and other ancient writers; yea and very probably, by the very Jews themselves, who bitterly hated them, cast off from themselves upon the poor Christians



on another account, which I specified in *Fiat Lux*. And through the whole Roman Empire did the sound of this scandal ring up and down for some ages together. Insomuch that *Tertullian* himself conceited, that as the Christian religion was derived from the Jews; so likewise that the imputation of the *asses head*, first put upon the Jews, might from them be derived upon Christian religion. And the same *Tertullian*, in his *Apologetick* adds these words: "The calumnies, saith he, invented to cry down our religion grew to such excess of impiety, that not long ago in this very city, a picture of our God was shown by a certain infamous person, with the ears of an ass, and a hoof on one of his feet, clothed with a gown, and a book in his hand; with this inscription, *This is Onochoetes the God of Christians*. And he addes, that the Christians in the city, as they were much offended with the impiety; so did they not a little wonder at the strange uncouth name the vaillain had put upon their lord and master; *Onochoetes* forsooth, he must be called *Onochoetes*. And are not you Sir a strange man, to tell me, page 393. that what I speak of this business is notoriously fals, nay and that I know it is fals, and I cannot produce one authentick testimony, no not one of any such thing. But this is but your ordinary confidence.

21 ch. from page 402. to 416,

I must not marvel that my following paragraph, called *Dirge*, is so wantonly plaid upon, in your one and twentieth chapter. You think of no body after they are dead; nor does it at all concern you, whether they be in hell, or heaven, or som third place, or not at all. But Sir, were not all the ancient monuments of the foundations of our churches, colledges, and chappels in *England* now destroyed, you would find your self with that wretched opinion of yours, absolutely incapable to enter upon any benefice, cure, or employment in this land. But the times are changed, and you have nothing now to do, but to eat, drink, and preach; for to morrow you shall dye.

22 ch. from page 416 to 435.

In your two and twentieth chapter, which is of the *Pope*, you do but only repeat my words, and not understand, and deny, and laugh.

23 ch. from page 435. to *Finis*.

Your last chapter is upon my paragraph of *Popery*, wherein I set down eleven other parcels of catholik profession, all of them innocent, unblamable and sacred. You only bite at *the first of them*; and having it seems enough filled your self with that, your wearied bones go to rest.

With *Mas comedido*, the title of my last paragraph

graff you meddle not at all: It is doubtless to you who understand not the English word *Mesfach*, another Gnostick *Paldabaorb*. But I would you had *Mas comedido* by heart.

You cannot but marvel, that I have taken so little notice all this while, of your only one strong and potent Argument, your stout *Achilles* that meets me in every paragraft and period, and beats me back into the walls of *Troy*. Wherever I am, whatsoever I say, your *πιδας δ' οὐδ' Ἀχιλλεύς* is upon me. All the discours of my whole one and thirty paragrafts, is by it fell'd to the ground, miserably bruised and battered with that one and the same *Τόυδ' αὐτοῦ ποταμοῦ*. But I hope you will have me excused. I have not leasur; I am not willing; I want ability to answer it, or give you any corresponding satisfaction. The like to our Authour, say you, for flourishing empty words and cunning sleights of subtilty hath been seldom, &c. Here our Authour falls into a great misadventure, &c. Here our Authour discovers not only his gross ignorance, but something more, &c. Our Authour beleevs not a word of all this, nor can, &c. We finde our Authour never to fail so palpably and grossly, as when, &c. Our Authour speaks notoriously fals, nor hath he, &c. Our Authours bistory, philosophy and reason all alike, &c. Our Authour speaks boldly, though he know it is not so, but, &c. Our Authour, if I could com to speak to him, would not  
own

own any of this, &c. Never any such cunning dissembling hypocrite as our Authour, &c. It is no mervail our Authour should still sail both in philosophy, antiquity, &c. who hath not, &c. In these and such like arguments, which occur almost as oft as the pages of your book, you rout Our Authour utterly. I am in all this not able to say both to a goos. Although I be not conscious of any either fraud in my breast, or fault in my book, or lye in either; yet in all such talk you must, and will, and shall have both the first and last word too.

Another argument of yours exprest in twenty places of your Animadversions, by which you would dissipate at once great part of *Fiat Lux* into the air, does as finely cant, as this does courtly defy. *The religion, say you, that is now profest in England, is that and only that which was first in ancient times received here, &c.* This you speak, and the more confidently do you speak it, the less significant you know your words be, and yet sounding well enough for your design. What do you mean I pray you Sir, by *that religion that is now profest in England*? Why do you not specify it? Speak it in down-right language. Is it *Papery* that has been peaceably profest in the land for almost a thousand years, and did all the good things we now finde in it; as yet profest by som? No; this you will deny. Is it *Prelate-Protestancy* that for threescore years  
opprest

opprest Popery here? If you had said this, you had praised that too much, which your self approves not. Is it *Presbytery* that warred the last twenty years, and utterly destroyed the foresaid Protestantcy? In saying this you had to your own danger disabled the English Protestant Church, now to the great heart-burning of the Presbyterians establisht again by law. Is it *Independency*, that for six or seven years curb'd the Presbyterian here, in — Tectour *Olivers* time, and had almost past an Act for the abolishing of the three P. P. P. Papish, Protestant, and Presbyterian. Is it *Quakery*, that is now far enough spread, and openly profest by many, and judges the Papist stark naught, the Protestant half rotten, the Presbyterian a quarter addle, and other Independents imperfect? Is it som general *abstracted religion*, that is common to them all? If it be so, then Popery as well as any other may be justly stiled the religion here first received. For that common notion in whatever you shall say it consists, so it be positive as it ought to be, will be found first and principally in the Papists faith. But this you have not thought good your self to expres, that you may seem to expres something, that may be thought good to your self, and ill to me. But you must deal candidly with me: I am an old oxe that hath fixed his foot firmly, and am not to be out-braved either with your canting

ing words or passionate execrations.

I had told you Sir, of all your tricks from page to page in particular, if nothing had been required at my hands to write, but only my own reply: but being, if I should do so, obliged to set down your talk too, I think it not worth either my charge or labour to reflect upon you such your voluminous impertinencies. And I have I assure you taken notice of all in your book, that may seem to have any appearance of reason in it, (though really there be none at all against me) and is not either manifestly untrue, or absolutely improper. This is all.

And now good Sir, I could wish you had given me the first letter of your name; that I might have known how to salute you. I have been told of late, that the Authour of the *Animadversions* upon *Fiat Lux* is one Doctour O. N., a Protestant against Popery which you found down, a Presbyterian against Protestancy which you threw down, an Independent against Presbyterianry which you kept down. But whether you be Doctour O. N., or to turn your inside outwards, you be N. O. Doctour; since I cannot be assured, it shall be all one to me. All that I have undertook at this time is to let you know, who ever you be, that I have read over your *Animadversions* upon my *Fiat*. And I thank you for your book; for it confirms

firms *Fiat Lux*, and all the whole design of it, I think irrefragably. It shows to the eye and really verifies by your own example, what *Fiat Lux* did but speak in words: namely that controversies of religion are endles for want of some one thing to fix upon, which may not be depraved; that they are fraught with uncharitable animosities, which darken the understanding and deprave good manners; that they are mutable as mens fancies be, which can never be fixedly stated, sith every man hath a spirit, hath a method, hath an opinion of his own, and sayes and denyes with endles diversity; that they are guileful and delusory, sometimes fals on both sides, ever on one, and yet still made out with subtil words, so plausible to the eye and ear, that men employed in the multitude of affairs and troubles of this world, can never be able to disintangle those knots of *pro* and *con*; then especially at a loss, when they consider, that such as mannage those disputes are all of them interested persons; firstly, that they are mad and irrational, while all parties pretend one and the same rule of holy scripture, and yet will admit of no exterior visible judg in their visible exterior contests: lastly, that they are mischievous and fatal to all places where they rise: as they have been of late to this our distressed Kingdom of *England*, where disputes and controversies about religion



gion raised to a height, by the inferiour scribes against their prelates, drew after them pikes and guns to make them good for twenty years together, with much desolation and ruin; which times I think I may not unjustly call the *Vicars Wars*. For the inferiour priests and levites, envying the dignities, glory and revenues of their prelates, when they could not otherwise get them into their own hands, by their lamentable tones in *Eloimi*, raised up the people of the land, to further their design. This trick of theirs they learned from wolves. For these, when they spy a waifaring man whom they would devour, and yet by a narrow search perceive him to be too strong for them, starting aside upon some *billock*; there set upon their tails, they howl for help.

And if any will not beleev *Fiat Lux*, that such be the fruits of disputes and controversies, and such their nature and *genius*, let them beleev the Authour of *Animadversions*, who as he sayes what he pleases, and denies what he lists; so to his frequent reproaches, villifications and slanders he adjoyns his own threatenings of terroure, to make my words good, and justify *Fiat Lux*.

You frequently threaten me, that if I write again, I shall *hear more*, far more than you have said in your *Animadversions*; but I promise you *Sir*, if you write again, you shall never hear more

more from me. For now the flies begin to come into my chamber, which may haply expect I should heed their flight and hearken to their buzz; and I must not leave those greater employments to look upon your *Animadversions*, or any your other books. Farewell.

Given this V. of the  
*Ides* of April in  
the year of our  
Lord MDCLXIII.

J. V. C.

---

Epistola

22

10

more from me. For now I begin to com-  
pare my character with the happy ex-  
ample of the noblest persons to their  
country. I do not know how great my  
virtue is, but I know it is not great.  
I am a poor creature, I feel it.

1790

Given at the  
City of New York  
this 10th day of  
June 1790

1790

1790

**EPISTOLA**

**AD**

**CROESUM,**

**AGAINST**

**Mr. Whitby.**

### The occasion of this second Epistle.

**D**OCTOR Pierce had preached a Sermon in the Court upon that text, In the beginning it was not so; from whence he took occasion to speak of Popery, which in this and that and the other particular, he said in the beginning was not so, and consequently all of it a novelty. This sermon was afterwards printed, and not a little applauded by those who are taken with such airs. Mr. Cressly a Catholik Gentleman, the Authours friend, then sojourning in London, wrote a book called, Catholik doctrine no novelties, in confutation of that Sermon, and went presently away to Paris. But after his departure Mr. Whitby set forth a huge bulk of a book against Cressly. The Authour in this his epistle gives notice to Mr. Cressly his friend then in France, of the contents and tenour of that his adversaries book.



Epistola ad Croesum, against  
Mr. Whitby.

S I R,

**I**T is now about a year, since Dr. *Pierce* made his pretty featous Sermon in the Court: where, by vertue of those few words of his text, *In the beginning it was not so, Matth. 19. 8.* he confuted all Popery in the space of one hour, as a meer bundle of novelties. The Treatise you left here in the hands of som friends, before your departure to *Paris*, to prove against the tenour of the said Sermon, *That Catholik doctrines are no novelties*, printed afterward by I know not what good hand, gave us here in *England*, after your departur, a great deal of good satisfaction. This book of yours about a moneth or two after it was extant, was seconded by another, against Dr. *Pierce* penned by *Jo. Sim.* a small, but a very quick and lively piece, to invalidate his reasons. So that *Pierce* had now two adversaries against him.

The latter *J. S.* hears not yet of any reply. But your book Sir is lately answered, not by Dr. *Pierce* himself, (who hath other irons in the

fire, and meets now with something in his own life, which in the beginning was not so) but by one Mr. *Daniel Whitby*, a young man, of a forward spirit, and possess'd as it seems of a fair reformed library, who hath undertaken, or is willing at least to undergo the quarrel. This book of *Whitbyes*, wherof my antient love and friendship hath here invited me to give you a brief account, is a great volum of 512 pages, so fruitful is the seed of controversie, when it is once sown, to increase and multiply. A compendium it is, I think, of his whole library.

Whether this book of his be made up all by one hand, by reason of the unity of the name, and diversity of styles discerned in it, is not easy to guess. But that Mr. *Whitby*, if he had many coadjutors with him, either in his own chamber or abroad, should by their mutual consent, alone reap the honour of all their labours, wherof his own part may haply be the least; you need, Sir, neither grutch, nor fear, nor envy, nor any way dislike. The book is of that natur, that it more behoovs, it should be thought to issue from one young head, then many old ones; that the insufficiency, when it shall appear, may be rather attributed to the weaknes of the Author, then caus he pleads for. Of this, Sir, I may out of *Whitbyes* own words in his Epistle Dedicatory, and the whole progres of his book, assure you; that this volume of his, is wholly



wholly made up of the many several replies of divers Protestant writers, who have stretcht their wits to the utmost in this last age, to evacuate the Catholik faith, and all their grounds, authorities and reasons for it; not only such as have written here in *England*, which are not a few, but those also beyond the seas, who are all met friendly here together, though never so much differing in their wayes, twenty at least or thirty of the chiefeſt, to help to make up *Mr. Whitbies* book.

These writers he tells us in his Epistle, ſom of them, who they be; Hammond, Field, Salmaſius, Baron, Uſher, Fern, Dally, Taylor, Crackanthorp, Hall, Andrews, Calixtus, Pleſſis, Chamier and Chillingworth. But he does not there mention Pareus, Blondel, Baxter, and ſeveral others, whom in the context of his book he makes as much uſe of, as any of thoſe he there honours with the title of Champions, with whoſe ſword and buckler he means to defend himſelf, and knock you down. You may eaſily gueſs the reaſon. Although indeed, even Chamier, Pleſſis, and Dally, his firſt and chiefeſt three, wer as great Puritans, as *Baxter*, *Pareus*, or *Blondel*, and no leſs enemies to the Engliſh Proteſtant, then Roman Catholik Church. And *Baxter* himſelf, if he will but do ſo much as dye, ſhall ſeven year hence, if not ſooner, be put into the next calendar, and ſit among the

Champions of the English Church, cited no more then, as guilty of faction and heresy, but as a Protector and Patron of the truth, famous Baxter, incomparable Baxter. So p. 230. he cites Dr. Reynolds, as a great Champion of his Church, who was indeed a Champion of the Puritans against it. Every non-Papist is a good Protestant, especially when he is dead. When they fight for their wives and children against catholick traditions and faith, then are they all holy zealous champions: But they are damned, and swerv notoriously from the truth, if they may be themselves beleaved, when they contest with one another; which ever happens after the first great victory with the common enemy obtained.

One thing is singular in this book of *Whitbies*, that he frames no answers out of any judgment of his own, ripened by a long and serious consideration of the things he speaks of, in this his reply; but recurs presently to the books of those his forenamed masters, in his library; and against your reasonings, only opposes their words and fore-studied evasions, such as they had invented, each one his own way, upon semblable occasions; not heeding at all, whether your discours, against which he writes, hath anticipated those shifts afore-hand, as generally it does, yea or no; nor how far they evacuate one another. This if he had pondred well, which perhaps poor man he could not do,

it had prevented much of his collections, and sunk his huge book into a far smaller bulk. To this, quoth he, *hath Chamier told you, that, &c. Can you not see what incomparable Chillingworth hath taught you, that, &c. You will still be impertinent, although great Plessis hath informed you, that, &c. Where wer your eyes, when reverend Hall hath so plainly told you, that, &c.*

And he brings sometimes, not only four or five several answers of one author to the same thing, all I suppose he found there written in his book, but half a dozen of those his authors, with all their manifold evasions to one single catholik ground; and for the most part so confusedly, that the first answer of the first author hath presently another first, as consisting of two parts; and the first of them may haply have another first; so that three succeeding periods begin oftentimes with three *firsts*, one after another, according as he penned them hand over head out of the books he wrote, venting his reasons, as som young children void worms, three or four, head and tails together. Nor heeds he at all, whether these his authors do chance to contradict one another, in those affairs for which he brings them in so unnaturally together; one affirming what the other denies, one rejecting what the other allows, one distinguishing what the other absolutely grants, &c.

This benefit he will reap by this confused

interlocution of his masters; that, if he come to be challenged upon any of the answers, which he makes by their lips, he shall not need, when he findes them either weak or fals, or any way prejudicial, to own then for his, what he had openly profest before-hand, to be another mans replies. So that they will serv a bird all bedecked with the feathers of many a fowl, for pride and pompous show unto such as will admire him, and to such as shall question him, for a present remedy of excuse, *This is not my feather, but the Cuckows. It is not my saying, but Chamiers. It is the reply of Chillingworth: It is the speech of Dr. Hammond, and not any assertion of mine, &c.* What can any one do, Sir, to such a man, but neglect him?

Truly I look upon *Whitby*, as a kind of master of Revels, that appoints other men who are to speak, every one their parts, and gives them their *qu* of entrance, whilst himself stands in som privat place to look on, and see how they do perform.

And he provides commonly against any one of your catholik grounds or reasons for it, four or five Protestant speakers, by their several wayes to disable it: wherof one shall haply say, that the authority you bring is good, but carries another meaning; a second shall affirm, it is naught and forged; a third stands indifferent, whether it be admitted or no, but is sure  
it

It makes against you; a fourth acknowledges it for your purpos, but disparages the authour, whence it is taken; a fift admits both the authority of the author, and truth of his words, but tells you it is only one of his errors; *Whitby* himself not saying all the while, which of all these replies he holds himself for good; but imagining you wholly oppress'd and overwhelm'd with his various collection of contradicting drollery, he passes on exulting to your next point or following reason, in the same mode and method to be crush'd.

And truly Sir, one may see in this one book of *Whitbies* at a view, what a judicious examiner, who loves to read and ponder all things seriously, cannot but observ in all the writers since the reformation, put together. One admits the catholik ground and authority; another rejects and villifies it; another accepts the words, but by some trope or other turns the sens; another allows the natural sens, but sayes it is one of his errors; another will not have that, nor any other authority upon earth, to be of any force in those affairs, &c. And thus they do about every particular of ancient faith; still laughing, and hugging one anothers fancies, though never so much contradictory, as well to one another, as to the common faith they all impugn.

What a strange confusion would this cause in  
the

the world, if the like proceeding were countenanced in civil, as here in spiritual affairs; and men might be outed of their estates and possessions by half a score witty lawyers, with cunning querks and subtle sophistries deluding his right and tenure, no judg admitted to give sentence. And indeed although this contest begin in spiritual affairs, yet it ever ends in civil. When they have once outed a Land of their old religion, and the prosperity and peace attending it, mens persons, estates, dignities, nay the very laws of the Land are apprehended, and brought into the power of these reformers, to the utter desolation of a Kingdom.

And as this book of *Whitbies*, Sir, is a compendious mirrour of all Anticatholiks dealing with the old Roman faith; so will I give you in civil affairs a perfect emblem of all *Whitbies* book: That all may clearly see, if this proceeding be allowable, what confusion and injustice must needs follow.

The Emblem of the old Roman religion I make *Caius* the seventeenth Knight, for example, of his family, which hath continued in the state time out of mind. A faction rises, to dispossess him of all that he and his ancestours had so long and peaceably enjoyed. They tell him in general, that his ancestors were intruders: but differ very much about the time, when the invasion was first made. One sayes 200 year ago,  
another

another 800, another 500, several men, several ways, and cannot agree. They com at last to his own particular title. *Caius* shews his forefathers succession legally descending, and quietly possessing for so many generations; and an evident testament also for himself, wherein it is expressly said, *Ego Gonvillus, &c. constituo Caium filium meum heredem bonorum meorum omnium, &c.* I Gonvil do constitute my son *Caius* heir of all my goods, &c. The adversaries, put case Chamier, Dally, Plessis, Blondel, Baxter, Hammond, Hall, &c. laugh at this, and tell him it is all impertinent, and proves nothing.

1 Alas quoth *Chamier*, these words are plainly corrupted. It was not written *Caium* but *Saium*: And the corruption is easie, only the bottom of the first letter being razed out.

2. Let it be as you will, quoth *Dally*, this testament can be of no value. For it proceeds upon an uncertain, if not fals, supposition. Who can say assuredly, that either you are his son *Caius*, or that *Caius* is indeed his son. 3. Either, quoth *Chillingworth*, you must be his son and actual heir, while he was alive, or when he was dead. Not while he was alive; for the right can be but in one at once: Not when he was dead, for no man can be a son to one that is not; no more then any person that is alive, can be a father to one that has no being. 4. Were this right, quoth *Baxter*, which is conveighed to you, in your  
father



father only, or in som others also besides himself? If in himself alone, why doth he say *constituo*, which signifies *simul statuo*, or I appoint together with others. 5. It seems to me, quoth *Blondel*, that this testament, Mr *Caius* is rather against, then with you. Either you pretend to be his son, before his testament was made, or after. If before, your own evidence witnesses against you; *Constituo Caium filium meum*, I make Caius my son. If after; then by this testament you are made his son, but supposed only an heir: and a title for that here is none at all. 6. He does indeed, quoth *Plessis*, make him truly his heir. But of what? not of his estate, which we contend about; but only of his goods, all his goods. And can you think Mr. *Caius*, that a dying man would speak improperly? surely no. The goods of the mind, virtue, prudence, temperance, these, as Aristotle witnesses, are *proprie bona*, properly are only to be called goods: But the goods of the body, and goods of fortune, these are improperly and falsely so called. 7. Let it be what kind of goods you will, quoth *Hall*, this very word *meorum*, Mr. *Caius*, quite overthrows all your pretensions. These are your fathers words you say; well then, if it be so, either the state you plead for is now his, or now not his. If it be now his, then it is not yours; if it be now not his, then the very title you rely upon is fals. 8. A testament

ment is to be taken in its strict and rigorous sens, quoth Field, and so the word *omnium* spoils your plea Mr. Caius. You must either have all his goods or none; but you have neither his good face, nor other his good endowments, &c. 9 Com, com, quoth Crackanthorp, we needed not have gon so far, or used so many words. *Caius* pretends, that his father, who made this testament, is the last of seventeen Knights of his family. Out of his own mouth I will condemn him, and with the very first word of his will he sayes his father made, which is *Ego*. For it is clear enough, that *Ego* is the first person, and not the last. And all these are ushered in by a young Whitby. *To this hath Chamier told you, that, &c. Can you not see what incomparable Chillingworth hath taught you, that, &c. You will still be impertinent, though learned Plessis hath informed you, that, &c. Where were your eyes, when great Dally hath told you, that, &c.*

In these few words Sir, I have given you a clear Emblem, not only of this book of Mr. Whitbies, but of all the writings have been made against catholik religion, since the reformation. Ther is no evidence so clear for that antient religion, but it is endeavoured several wayes to be made frustrate: Although unto Catholiks, who understand their religion, those evasions signifie no more then these I have specified,  
against

against a title most irrefragable and firm. Yet in that contest children and unexperienced people, would judg poor *Cains* to be utterly lost. And so indeed he will, if those crafty Lawyers may determin the busines without recours to any Judg: as is don in all our affairs and controversies of religion. How many sophistical evasions is he to answer about one and the same thing? How many captious snares to incur, in any one of his answers? to be overwhelmed without doubt, while no Judg interposes, either with their multitude of words, or force of arms. But enough of this, which indeed can never be too much thought of.

Mr. *Whitby*, Sir, begins and ends his book just as you begin and end yours, against which he writes. For as you in the conclusion of your book set down som rules, which you desire him that shall reply unto it, for more clearnes and order, and substantiallity of discours, to observ; so *Whitby* in the end of this his reply against your book, wherein he hath not heeded to observ so much as any one of those your good rules, does also prescribe laws for you, if you mean to answer him again, wherof the first is, *That you consider all the answers he hath given to any of your arguments: and that otherwis, if any one single answer remain, your agument must be invalid*, p. 501. This is the first and wittiest of his conditions. For the several shifts and evasions of

of above twenty men, which he makes use of, about most of the substantial points of controverſie, being all put together and multiplied, as they be, to ſom thousands, would, if they ſhould be all ſpoken to in particular, though never ſo briefly, raiſe ſuch a bulk of a book, as hath been ſeldom ſeen, and would never be read. But being, as I have already told you, contradictory one to another, and ten to one exceſſively childiſh, would no leſs diſable the repute and gravity of that man, who ſhould ſo much as take notice of them, then to play with boyes at ſpan-counter in the ſtreets.

And as he ends his book with the ſame method of preſcribing laws, as you concluded yours; ſo doth he begin his in the very ſelfſame words as you enter yours. *I cannot forbid my ſelf to wonder that, &c.* So begins your book. *I cannot forbid my ſelf to wonder that, &c.* ſo begins this book of his, which he writes againſt you, imitating and repeating your very words for many lines together, and returning them hand over head upon your ſelf, by the method of our good women of Billingsgate, not caring, ſo he ſay again what you ſpeak, how true or falſe, juſt or unjuſt his words be.

Thus much in general, I ſhall ſay more by and by, after I have briefly told you, what he does in each particular chapter of his book.

*His first ch. from page 1 to 7.*

Is a bitter inveſtive againſt Papiſts, whom he concludes for their cruelties and diſloyalty, unworthy of mercy or any affection. He acknowledges indeed, that *Catholik religion cannot ſtand juſtly charged with any ſuch crimes*, p. 2. But yet he layes the crimes upon them all notwithstanding, ſo indefinitely, and only upon them, that he excludes univerſally all profeſſours of that religion, and them alone, from all compaſſion and love: Although he knows in his heart, both that the religion, the very religion of ſome others in this land, ſtands juſtly charged with thoſe crimes, whereof he acknowledges catholic religion free; and that Papiſts alſo or Roman Catholiks, are the only men, that have univerſally exhibited themſelves unblamable, towards that breſt of love and mercy, from whence he would have them all excluded.

And to make theſe Papiſts odious, he names ſome wars and troubles of theirs in Ireland, Poland, Bohemia, Savoy. Indeed he needed not have wandred ſo far as Bohemia or Poland. The ſtory of our own England would have afforded a large volum of matter, if all that Papiſts have ever don muſt be attributed to their religion, for wars and broils enough to tire a reader. How many battles have there been here between the Scot and Engliſh, between the Sax and Norman, between the Norman and Brit-  
ton;

ton, between the English and French at Agencourt, and all over France; with much bloodshed and slaughter; between the two houses of York and Lancaster at home, when all these parties were Papists; and no other religion known amongst them. Is there no other principle to attribute all these disorders unto, but that religion, which endeavours, as much as it is able, to stifle all these evil fruits of concupiscence amongst men; which some time or other will shoot up, notwithstanding all the heavenly endeavour of that divine seed, implanted in men on purpos to suppress it. Must or can Protestants be justly charged, with the treasons, murders, robberies of all such as have been imprisoned in our Jayls, or hanged at Tyburn, since the reformation? And yet thus we deal with poor Catholiks, to adde affliction upon affliction, and extinguish that small sparkle of life which is left in their bodies.

It is surely a general fault in Protestants, that we think in our hearts, whatever we speak outwardly, that Roman catholiks are, as they should be, all Saints, all spotles in their lives, all of them unblamable, universally unblamable. And hence it is, that if ever we discover one traytor, fool, or knave amongst any of that profession, we exult and make bonfires for joy, and record it in our books one age after another; that all the world may know, and ever

remember, that even som of them have been transgressors. We do not wonder so at our own Protestants, though thousands of them should prove traytors together, and many are continually hanged, and som also burnt for their wicked crimes. I am sure the Papists have not themselves, any such opinion of men of their own religion, that they should so necessarily be honest and good, as that it is impossible any should be otherwis. But even in catholik countreys, they have their whips and stocks, and gibbets and prisons, and torturs, provided for malefactors, as well as we have here. And Princes will there go to wars, as well as we. Did not the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* do so? And the people too think themselves bound, even by their religion, to follow them. Nor have any people rose in rebellious herds, to do mischief, but they would sometimes pretend religion for it, although they act indeed against the dictamen not only of other mens religion, but perhaps their own too. Catholiks know their religion is good, and pure and holy, and apt to make all men so, that walk according to its direction. But if any swerv, they pitty indeed, and pray for their serious repentance; but they wonder not, as we do at it; much less do they rejoyce, when any of our Protestants are taken and hanged for treason; nor do they write, or spread it abroad in books, nor make bonfires, or keep holy-dayes



dayes for joy of a thing, which is indeed the object of their grief and pittie.

But Mr. *Whitby* speaks here so much of *equivocations* and *mental reservations*, as proper and peculiar only unto Papists, which render them, although they should promise and swear allegiance never so seriously, not at all to be beleaved or trusted; that I began to doubt, whether all London, and the whole Land, may not haply be Papists, although I thought not of it. One thing I am sure of, and all men are of my mind, that when we go into a shop in London, or into any market or fair in England to buy wares, when they tell us, yea and swear too, that the thing we cheapen cost them so much out of their own purse, we do not beleev a word they say, but think they have either som reservation in their mind, or use an equivocation or ly. And even Mr. *Whitby* himself, must either be a Papist too, if mental reservation be peculiar only unto them, when he sayes so often in his book, of which I treat, *That there is not one reason in Mr. Cresseys book that is pertinent, not one authority but corrupted, not one instance but uskered in with disadvantages to the truth, and forgery*: or if he be not a Papist, he must in these and several other passages in this his book, wherein he either secretly equivocates, or openly lyes, at least *papistare*, and act that, which he sayes only Papists practice.

To give one example, he sayes p. 237. *That one general council calls the respect given to images a hundred times by the name of worship. I have good reason to think, that one Council would not use that word much above fourscore times, if they be rightly numbred. So likewise he sayes here p. 4. That the whole colledg of Jesuits in London said, that they would rather promote the late Kings ruin then hinder it, lest the Puritans should make use of his distresses to any advantage. O too too foolish and malicious calumny ! For surely, this is something more then an equivocation. They rather promote then hinder it ! How could they do either the one or the other ? Thus som of our mad countrey-men were not ashamed to tell it abroad, about ten years ago, even in catholik countreys where they travelled, that they who sate in Court, and condemned our gracious King, were most of them Papists and Jesuits. And did all the whole colledg of Jesuits in London conclude this, so generally, that there was not any one against it ? Who took the votes, that he could be so assured of this great sceret ? And where is this colledg of Jesuits in London ? Who ever heard of any such thing ? Will ever any of this wild talk pass for other, then the dream of a man in Bedlam ? We shall ere long be frightened by such as *Whitby* and *Baxter*, from hanging our pot over the fire, lest the whole colledg of Jesuits in the*  
MOON,

moon, should conspire together, to water down upon our heads, and spoil our pottage. They would never tell us these things, or hope to be beleaved, were not the opinion they hav of our reason as small, as the confidence they hav of their own audacity is great? And what will the colledg, the whole colledg of Jesuits here in London determin next? If they should chance to decree, that no whale, or cod or her-ring should ever com into the North seas, as now it is not unlikely they may, they will undo many a family.

In the end of this his first chapter, are cited som Councils severity against heretiks, wherin Mr *Whitby* thinks himself concerned with much regret and anger. *One of these*, saith he, *was kept at Lateran, the other at Leyden under Pope Innocent.* I suppose *concilium Lateranum* is the council he sayes was kept at Lateran; though his Dictionary of proper words will not help him to understand, in what countrey that town of Lateran is to be found. And *concilium Lugdunense* is that which he englishes the council of Leyden; all the history and reading Mr. *Whitby* has, not been able to distinguish betwixt *Ludunum Batavorum*, and *Lugdunum in Gallia*; betwixt Leyden in Holland, where never any council was kept, and Lyons in France, where Pope Innocent held that council, whilst he sojourned in Burgundy. But though he be

yet but raw, you shall find him a greater proficient by and by.

As for that council of Lateran, wherein is a confiscation of goods and other penalties decreed, upon such as run into disturbing heresies; it touched only exteriour disciplin or temporal statutes, and no article or busines of religion. Nor did the Church make any such constitution by her own authority, but declared only, what secular power may justly do, when they think it expedient and necessary, to prevent further evils. What power have Priests and Byshops over mens estates and lives? But the Emperour and Kings were willing to have it so ordained in that venerable assembly; that with a more plausible colour they might be able to provide for their Kingdoms peace, even in those affairs which they themselves were to execute, though not to determin. Nor does any King in Christendom think himself any further obliged by that decree, to put such laws in execution, then he shall with his privat council think fit. And all secular princes, will by the advice of their peers proceed to such penalties, when they pleas, whether any synod decree it or no. Nor is it the wors, if a council do say that in som cases may be don, which princes in their discretion think expedient.

*His 2 ch. from page 7 to 9.*

Tells us, that Mr. *Whitby* is here in a trembling

bling sweat, good Sir, for your faults. *I tremble*, saith he, *to consider that our Author should be so imprudent to say no wors, to call God to witness to his soul, that he hath studiously avoided all caveling distortion of texts, &c.* And then he addes with a new fervour, *That all Fathers are miserably corrupted by you, and allegations most disingenuously forged.* And if it be not so, quoth he, *I will forfeit presently my life.* Good man, he engages very far, as you see, for you. He will dy, dy presently; if Fathers, all the Fathers, be not corrupted, miserably corrupted, by you. And this he will do without any trembling, if he do not make that good which he trembles to think of. But it is no wondrous matter I think, to hear him utter such daring words, although he use here none of his mental reservations. He knows himself as safe as a thief in a mill; and that it will never be put to a Jury, to find whether he be guilty or no.

His first chapter was fuming wrath; this second a shivering fear: And so he proceeds, from one passion to another, quite through his book, even to the end, to verifie his own words in his Epistle to his Patron, where upon the sight of your book, he saith, *that he found himself put into such a passion, as vented it self into this reply.* But these passious of his, and the various vilifications both of your book and person, wherewith this reply of his, and assault against

Catholiks is stult, or any other of his calumnies and bitter invectives against Papists, which are many and hainous. I shall not trouble you with now. You must have patience, and let them pass, as other good people do, where ever you meet them. Ministers, good men, fight for their wives and children, either those they have or hope to have, which will be undon and lost, if the odium of Popery, and of all such as any way excuse and defend their innocence, be not smartly kept up. My adversary OeN did as much to innocent *Fiat Lux*, which had no other fault, but that it had excused the faultles. To do well and hear ill, this must be the lot, as that is the endeavour of all good men in this world.

*In his 3 ch. from page 9. to 17.*

The challenge of Bishop Jewel for the first 600 years against Papists, which all his graver brethren disliked, Mr. Whitby, if his word here be of any worth, will make it good, yea and enlarge it with Perkins, White, Baxter, and Crackanthorp to 800, yea 1200 years, *wherein there was not, they say, any such creatur as a Papist in the world.* And he cares not a pin, though Beza, Melancton, and Luther, acknowledged to the contrary, that Popery hath the prerogative of Antiquity, before all other waies. Beza, saith he, *and Melancton are strangers to us. Must we be accountable for Luthers words?* And yet

yet all over his book, he makes more use of strangers, & gives more credit to them, then any of our own, and would have us do so too. Are not Chamier, Dally, Plessis, Grotius, Blondel, as much strangers, and of as little credit, as Beza, Melancton, and Luther. But what if our own Dr. *Willet* speaks for the Papists antiquity above others? What if our own *Whitaker* say, that to beleeve by the testimony of the Church, is the very heresie of the Papists? O then his answer is ready at hand. *What is all this to the purpos? did ever any Protestant say otherwis? do they therfor confess their antiquity?* The strippling fears no colours. If any or many both of our own and forreign Protestants do acknowledge the Papists antiquity, why, what then? If some deny it, then it is so. It is as they say, who say as he sayes. And if any say otherwise, it is otherwise. It is not so.

Ther is one assertion in this his third chapter, that deserves I think to be written in capital letters. For p. 16. having told you Sir, that *Protestants either affront the evidence of Scripture against Papists, or the intent of the Apostles, or rather of God himself, &c.* he thinks therfor, that Protestants rejection of Popery may well be excused, and especially, saith he, (these are his words so much remarkable) *When you Papists know, we hold that in all matters of faith, it is all one withus, to be prater Scripturam, and to be*  
con-



*contra.* That is, in plain English, what is not in Scripture, that Protestants hold to be against it. And is this so?

First, it is hard to say, how far matters of faith reach. Ther is one sort of people now in England, that would have all things acted and disposed even in civil affairs, only according to the tenour of Gospel. And what is beside it, they conclude by this very axiom to be against it. And so they decry all our Courts, our very Justices of peace and Constables. But in ecclesiastical affairs, the proper businesses of the Church, and matters of religion, as distinct from civil, this is the plea which the good Quakers use against the Bishops and Priests, of not only the Roman, but even this our English Church, which Whitby defends. Why, say they to them, why are we harrassed, imprisoned, beaten and spoiled so many wayes, by your instigation, who have made your selves drunk with the blood of Saints? Do not we either confront the evidence of Scriptur against you, or the intent of the Apostles, or rather of God himself, and tell you expressly, that you oppose the evidence of Gods word, in your observances and ordinations, in your tythes and Lents, and Mass-tides, in your lawn sleeves and cassocks and canonical girdles, in your Pulpits, Universities, and Steeple-houses, in your Chapters and Deanaries, in your orders and degrees,

in

in your oppressions of conscience and jurisdictions, in your surplices, copes, and preaching for hire, &c. Is it not enough to shew our innocence, in not accepting these things, because in the beginning it was not so? nor were any of these things to be found amongst the apostles. Especially when you know, we hold, and we know also you hold, that in matters of faith and religion, it is all one, to be beside Scriptur, and to be against it. Are your Chapters and Deanaries, your lawn sleeves and surplices, your Lents and common-prayers, your tythes and livings of five or six hundred a year, your universities, and steeple-houses in Scriptur and Christian Gospel, yea or no? If they be there, shew it us. If they are besides scriptur or not in it, then are they by your own confession here, against it.

*Ch. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. from p. 17. to 90.*

These five following chapters speak against *ecclesiastical Supremacy*, either amongst the apostles or any other succeeding prelates. And with so much earnestnes and little heed doth *Mr. Whitby* whiff away all your defence of it, that he strikes off that authority, not only from the Popes head, but from any Prince or Prelate whatsoever; not caring so the Roman fall, if the English Prelacy sink too. So earnest indeed is he bent against it, that he professes p. 39. *he would sooner perswade himself of the truth of Mahomet's*

*metes fables, then any such pretension.* Thus well is he disposed against the coming of the Turk.

These few propositions he advances here amongst others. 1. *That the apostles had an equality of power and jurisdiction or dignity over the rest.* But whence then comes our English Hierarchy, of byshops, arch-bishops, ministers, and deacons? Whitby himself denies, that our Kings are the root of Episcopal jurisdiction here in England; *Who ever thought so*, quoth he, p. 88. I think I could show him out of the statutes and laws of the Land, that our English Episcopacy, and their whole jurisdiction, is from the King, as the sole fountain and root of it. But if it be not so; and no such subordination, as here he affirms, was ever found amongst the apostles, whence is our English Hierarchy? If it neither come from God nor from the King, it may not irrationally be suspected, to be from an insufficient if not an ill original.

His second is, *that such an ecclesiastical jurisdiction is useless, and unable to prevent schismes, whether they rise from breach of charity or difference of judgement*, p. 20. And if it be useless for that, for Gods sake what is it good for? Third is, *that to submit to one, is to slight the judgment of thousands, that may be as wise as he; and to endanger the very being of religion.* Ibid. And is it so indeed? why then are so many millions here in England subjected to one Bishop, much

much people to one minister, all the people, ministers, and byshops to one King? Is this to slight all that are subjected, or to endanger the very being of religion. Fourth is, that *general causes cannot be dispatched by one supreme governour over all, as may particular by inferiour superintendents.* And other such like fanatick assertions he has; which do as much evacuate the subordination of our English as the Roman Church, and civil government as well as ecclesiastical hierarchy. I am sure they have done both, even in this our Kingdom, and in our own dayes: a thing which will not be soon forgotten. And little did I think to see any prelatick minister broach such whimsies again here in our land, so lately made desolate thereby. What he means by it I cannot tell. But I am sure he is not so unadvised, but he understands the consequence. For p. 423. upon his grant of a liberty of judging to particular persons, in matters of religion; whence all our wars and animosities here in *England* do first flow, even so far as to deny obedience therupon to their spiritual superiours, he speaks thus: *Would a gracious King, think you, presently condemn all those to the utmost severity, who in such cases after consultation and deliberation duly made, by reason of some prejudices or weaknes of reasoning, should be induced to think it their duty to follow the mutinous party?* he craftily uses the phrase of *utmost*

*seve-*

severity, the better to palliate his more secret judgment, who by his own principles here and elsewhere not obscurely expressed, must needs conceiv them liable to no severity at all.

But that you may see, Sir, this adversary of yours, what a lively spark he is, he makes in his 5 chapter the very Popes themselves, when significantly they would express their own supremacy, either to say nothing for it, or altogether against it. If Pope *Agatho* speak of his own solicitude over the Churches of God, even to the utmost bounds of the ocean. Whitby thence infers, that *his headship therfor is not universal, becaus it is bounded*. Is not this witty? And thus the great Prophet, when he describes the vaste unlimited extent of the Messias his dominion (*dominabitur à mari usque ad mare, & à flumine usque ad terminos orbis terrarum*) must be understood to limit and confine it.

Again, if Pope *Julius* defend his acts of power and jurisdiction, by ancient cannons and custom; Whitby concludes from thence, that *it is not therfor of divine institution; for custom and cannons are but humane*. Witty still. Thus a master, when sending his servant on an errand, he tells him he may well go, for that he gave him lately a pair of new shooes, loses therby all his other claim of commanding him.

Again, if *St. Gregory* prefer the Apostolicall  
See

See before other Churches. *That is*, quoth Whitby, *not for it self, but for the Emperours seat.* And for the same reason must the Byshop of London or Abbot of Westminster, if any now were, be preferred before the Byshop of Canterbury.

If Pope *Leo* derive his authority from *St. Peter* prince of the apostles, *That may infer*, quoth he, *a precedency of order, but not any dignity.* A Prince, it seems, signifies only one that is to go before, not one, that has any dignity or power to command those that follow after. Thus will your adversary put authorities into his mouth, and draw them in an instant, most nimbly out of his throat, without ever touching his stomach. Can we think him unable, by such Hugonot evasions, to whiff away all the four gospels and apostles creed, as to its former sence and meaning, if there should once be a necessity urging him to submit to Mahomets fables, or reconcile them and his creed together? Who dare say he cannot do it, and do it as wisely too, as perhaps he ever did thing in his life.

I think it not amiss Sir, to give you yet a little further taste here of our Author; your adversaries nimblenes, only som little of much; for I mean to be very brief.

Doth emperor *Valentinian* establish, that whatsoever is decreed by the See apostolik, which is raised upon the merits of *St. Peter*, dig-

dignity of the city, and authority of counsellors should have the force of a law to all Bishops? *Valentinian*, saith *Whitby*, *was a young man and easily seduced.* What doth this conclude for the Popes supremacy, &c. The laws then of Kings and Emperours are to be weighed, it seems, by the age of the law-maker. And if he should be a young man, they signifie nothing against any delinquent or transgressor, if he have but the wit to plead here with *Whitby*, that the King was young, when that law was made. This easily seduced young mans law was in force notwithstanding, in following times, and put into the code by the old mature grave man, and not easily seduced Emperour *Justinian*: And no man either young or old ever excepted against it, for the youth of the legislator. Young Princes do not make laws as boyes tell tales, only by strength of their own wits. *Valentinian* was a young man, and his laws therfor, according to *Whitby*, not to be regarded: And what then shall we think of our English protestancy, which was here first publikly set up by King *Edward the sixth*, a child.

Doth an ecclesiastical cannon say, that no decree can be established in the Church, without the assent of the Roman bishop. *That is*, quoth *Whitby*, *except the Roman Bishop be present.* What doth this make for supremacy? &c. But if he have no authority there, why may he  
not



not as well be absent. There is no certain number required for the making of a decree; and that byshop does no more, it seems, then make up a number.

Doth the council of Ephesus refer the judgment of the Patriarch of Antioch his caus to the Pope? for that the Church of Antioch had been ever governed by the Roman. *That was,* saith Whitby, *not to use his authority, but only to know his mind, &c.* And what matters it, I pray, what his mind may be, if the others never mean to heed it. We consult any that are present, whether equal or inferiours, to know their minds, and yet do our selves what we list: but we never trouble men a thousand miles off for that. Surely when a judgment is referred by parties to another power so far distant, with great expence and long expectation, and only upon this ground, that they are subject, and have ever been governed by that power, they cannot be thought only to require his mind, but use his authority. Our honest Quaker will not be unwilling thus to have his caus referred to the judgment of our English Bishops; not to use their authorities, but only to know their minds.

Doth the Sardican council ordain, that in a controversie between byshops, Appeal should be made to the Byshop of Rome, to appoint Judges, and renew the proces. *That cannons*  
 K. sayes

sayes he, *is against the Papists*; for it permits the Pope to receiv, not to command appeals, &c. So then: Papists, it seems, think the Pope may command, not receiv appeals. And besides, saith he, *the appellation was there ordained ad Julium Romanum, not ad Papam Romanum: Not to the Pope who then was Julius; but to Julius who then was Pope.* We have here surely another Hudibras; In logick a great critick, profoundly skilled in Analytick; he can distinguish and divide a hair 'twixt South and South-West side. Appeal to Julius Pope, not to Pope Julius! And what does he think to gain by this subtilty? The cannon he hopes will ceas forsooth, when Julius dies. O the wit of some men above other some, especially when it is assisted by French Hugonots who drink good wine. Our English ale could never have made us out so subtil a distinction as this is.

Doth the council of *Arles* send their decrees to the Byshop of Rome, from whom all Christians are to receiv what to beleev and practis? Here is something of trouble, quoth Whitby, but nothing of jurisdiction in the Pope, &c. Can any thing hang more tight then this? Conciliar decrees must be sent to Rome, from whence all Christians must receiv what they are either to beleev or practis. But this is not to acknowledg his power, but to trouble his patience.

Doth St. Basil say, it is convenient to write  
to

to the byshop of Rome to conclude affairs, *δυναὶ γνῶμην* and to pass his sentence? O, quoth he, *δυναὶ γνῶμην*, doth not signifie to give sentence, but advice. Here you have a spice of his grammer to mix with his logick; *γνῶμην* signifies counsel, and *βέλη* is greek for a juridical sentence.

Doth Athanasius fly to Rome against the Eusebians, and Pope Julius appoint a day in his behalf *ἐν δίκην*, for plea and judgment, *τῷ πᾶσι ἐκκλησίαις ἐπόμενον νόμῳ*, following therein the law and method of the Church. *He followed that law*, saith Whitby, *not in citing them, but in not condemning them uncited. &c.* He was just then, in not condemning parties uncited. But by what authority he either cited or judged them, we must not here know. Is ther any law of the Church, that justifies a condemnation of persons cited to judgment, when they are neither cited nor judged by any legal authority? And it is to be observed here, Sir, all this while, and quite through his book, that Whitby has forgot the fearful execration he made upon himself in the beginning, *that all fathers are miserably corrupted by you, and allegations most disingeniously forged, &c.* This I say he has quite forgot, even so far forgot, that there is not one authority in a hundred, that he does so much as challenge either of forgery or corruption. And is therfor in danger to forfeit presently his life. But he

was then in his own heat, now he is amongst his Protestant authors, who afford him other kind of evasions. And we must leav him to their wits, when he has lost his own memory.

Doth S. Augustin witnes, that the caus of the Donatists in Africa was judged by Pope Melchhiades in Rome. *This was, saith Whitby, a brotherly, not an authorative decission.* I make no doubt it was brotherly, but why not authorative? Mr. Whitby hath seen perhaps som elderly cockerel, to part the frayes of younger chickens; and thinks tribunals of byshops do no more. The Pope, it seems, was ever a loving brother at least, still ready to decide the frayes of all Churches and Byshops upon all occasions; which was a pious and good work, and not belonging to Antichrist. He would do well Sir, to part this fray of yours with Mr. Whitby, which otherwis will never be ended.

Is the Roman Patriarch said, to have the care of all the Churches? *Any one, saith Whitby, may have that repute; for he that serves one Church serves all.* And if Whitby get but the cure of any one little Chappel here in England, though it be but to read prayers in an hospital, he must then be beleevd to have the solicitude of all the English Churches upon him.

In brief, doth S. Chrysostom, to declare a supremacy among the apostles, affirm, that St. James obtained the throne of Jerusalem, but  
St.

St. Peter was constituted master and teacher, not of one throne, but of the whole world, τῆς ἐκκλεσίᾳς διδάσκαλος. *That text, sayes he, is in all likelihood by negligence of transcribers, or som other way, mistaken. However it makes nothing for supremacy: were not all the apostles so? He gathers they were all so, becaus the peculiarity of the title, master and teacher of the whole world, is there attributed unto one, exclusively to all the rest. Every minister is a byshop or overseer, if we mind only the signification of the word, but is he therfor so in the whole meaning and peculiarity of the title?*

Finally, doth our Mr. Whitgift acknowledg, that the apostles were all equal as to their function, not as to government; equal *quoad ministerium*, not *quoad polititiam*; which is a plain and manifest assertion, Sir, of the supremacy you plead for? *What is this*, saith Whitby *to the purpos?* He findes never a word in that speech of Dr. *Whitgift*, which begins with s. u. p. and therfor cries out, *What is this to the purpos? what is this to supremacy?*

You must not expect, Sir, that in the succeeding chapters, I should give you any more account of the particular quicknesses of your adversary. They are all like these which I have here briefly hinted to you in this first controverted point of Supremacy; only that you may see, that he, or the several champions rather,

which he makes use of, have more distinctions than one. But by such evasions, distinctions, and shifts, wherewith most men are now made so acquainted, that they can use them nimbly against any laws and authorities either divine or humane, are the people of our distressed Kingdom carried up and down, like a cork in water, or gossimor in the air, with every wind and billow of a fancy, now here, now there, being removed once from their ancient stability, unto endless disquiet. Cannot a man in this manner and method, evacuate, slight, and frustrate every thing? What authority, law, or custom, either human or divine, can stand in force, if it may be thus by Whitbean Sophomorisms laughed out of countenance? I will be bold to say, that the witty Presbyterian does more substantially refute all prelatick principles and practices, then these answer the Roman. Nay these in answering the Roman, have made way for the Presbyterian: And yet they will still be scribbling.

But you must know Sir withall, that Mr. Whitby in his intervals or cooler moods, allows the Roman Patriarch, a priority of order and honour, although he will not afford him any authority or jurisdiction. A *πρωτοκλισία*, or uppermost seat he shall have, although no supremacy or power. For he sayes p. 52. *The byshop of Rome was to do it*, (judg causes he means, receive appeals, and the like) *more especially for*  
the

the dignity of his seat, which made him prime in order of Bishops. And again p. 66. St. Basil calling the Bishop of Rome *ὑπάρχοντος ὁριζήσαντος*, the head or apex of Western Bishops, makes him only, saith he, the chief in order, and most eminent Bishop of the West, which title we can very well allow him. So that the Pope, if he should come hither to us, either for love or hospitality, although our bishops will not allow him authoratively to visit, keep chapter, make laws, or punish any of them for transgressing the ecclesiastical canons, yet will they give him a *πρωτοκλισία*; and suffer him, if Mr. Whitby be any legal master of ceremonies, to sit at the upper end of the table. And St. Peter, it seems, had no more. Nor had he any power, so much as to command any man to rise from the table, if he behaved himself unmannerly at his meat.

And such a precedency he allows his own chief Superiour, the Arch-bishop of Canterbury; and no more. *A Metropolitan*, saith he, p. 23. *hath no jurisdiction over bishops: He can do nothing, &c.* And again page 33. *His grace of Canterbury hath no power of jurisdiction over bishops.* And this he speaks boldly; although he assert withall, that a bishop hath jurisdiction over parish-priests, and these over their parishioners. So that according to Whitby, that authority, dignity, and power which is in the lowest, must be wanting in the highest degree of



hierarchy; which must, if this be true, end with power, and begin with feebleness; contrary both to common reason, and that famous speech of learned Porphyry, *In summis est unitas cum virtute, in infimis multitudo cum debilitate*. Mr. Whitby has no hope perhaps ever to be made Metropolitan, although he may possibly see himself a bishop; and will not therefore devalue himself beforehand, of the dignity he may one time or other arrive at, although the far call the grapes, he has no hopes to reach, unsavory and sower stuff.

But his grace of Canterbury, hath he no jurisdiction, Mr. Whitby, over bishops? What law, custom, or tradition gives bishops a power over parish-priests, which allows not a Metropolitan as much over bishops? And if he have only a precedency of place, then can these have no more: And it is as easie to say the one, as the other. And is all our hierarchy com only to a precedency of honour? Here will be fine work for a Quaker, who will as resolutely deny the honour, as you the power. How comes that eminent person to be stiled his *grace of Canterbury*, but only for his power, dignity, and jurisdiction over the venerable bishops? And this power and dignity hath, I am sure, belonged to the See of Canterbury ever since the first planting of Christianity among the English, which enables that bishop to make laws, to visit his

his province, to call together his byshops, to censure, to punish even Prelates themselves, if they transgress the canons: which is as much as any byshop can do to his parish priests. Is it not a strange presumption in a young man, thus to disable his own chief prelate before his face, and say peremptorily, that a Metropolitan can do nothing; that his grace of Canterbury hath no jurisdiction. I know, and am fully assured, ther is not one of thole poor catholik priests who were lately banished out of England, but would have defended even to extremity, if need were, this one most certain verity, That a Metropolitan hath a jurisdiction, as solid and good a jurisdiction over byshops, as any these can have or plead for over parish priests. And by as firm and good and ancient law is the one established as the other, and indeed by the very same; whilst a minister of his own presumes to tell the Arch-bishop his own prelate to his face, that he hath no jurisdiction at all.

*His pub. from page 91. to 169.*

Is wholly fanatick. There he tells us plainly, That neither Convocations, Byshops, nor Parliaments are judges of our faith: That the English Church doth not punish for difference in opinions, nor require that all should beleeve as she beleevs, or submit to her determinations, but leaves every man to the liberty of his own judgment, so he do not make factions against her. Who ever urged men.

saith

saith he, to beleev as the Church beleevs ? p. 101. Also, that no decrees of any Church are further to be admitted, then they appear to particular mens judgments to agree with scriptur. That every private man must make use of his own reason, to judge or reject doctrin and rites propounded, though scriptur be his guide. That the business must there end, without resigning to any further authority, which is all as fallible as we be our selves : That points fundamental are as perspicuous as the sun-beam, and points not fundamental, the Church doth not determin them ; and if any dispute should rise about them, she silences indeed, but expects not her children should be of her opinion, only would not have them gainsay her : That that Church does but mock us, which expects a beleef to her proposals, becaus she pretends to guide her self by scriptur. For if scriptur must bend to their decrees, and we must have no sence of scriptur, but what they think fit, then their decrees and not scriptur is our last rule : And it is a pretty devise, quoth he, first to rule the rule, and then be ruled by it, &c. Can a good Quaker say more for himself, or desire more to be said for him. If we be not bound to beleev, we are not bound to hear. Nay, we are bound not to hear any such Church, lest we should chance to beleev what aforehand we condemn, and they themselvs dare not justifie.

He hath much of this talk up and down in his book ; Faith, saith he p. 439. cannot be compelled.

pelled. By taking this liberty of discretion from men, we force them to become hypocrites, and so profess outwardly what inwardly they disbelieve. And again p. 450. We allow not any man openly to contradict the Churches decrees. But when he thinks contrary to the determination of our Church, he must keep his judgment to himself, only refusing obedience with all humility, till he be better informed. No fanatick will desire to refuse obedience any longer.

Thus doth this champion deliver up himself and Church, unto the will and disposal of all whatever sects; and cares not, so he may avoid catholick obeysance, to make himself a prey to those, who upon these grounds here laid down, will soon turn him out of Church and pulpit too, and strip him not only of his cloak, but his coat also.

At last he answers the catholick arguments for the Churches assured and infallible guidance, just as he did before your others for supremacy. Seeing him there, you see him every where.

Finally he brings in, for a certain testimony of the Churches liability to error, the two opinions so rise in old time, about communicating infants, and the Millenaries thousand years of blessedness with Christ in this world, after dooms-day: Which are both of them now condemned, saith he, by a contrary belief and practice of the present Church, although they were held

*held by not a few very antient Fathers in the primitive times.* And in this he triumphs exceedingly. Surely without cause I should think. Those primitive doctors, we may be assured, knew something more then their Catechism, and committed to writing, something of that they conceived, beyond their Christian faith, as well as the present Fathers and Doctors of the Church now do. And if there were so great varieties of opinion among them concerning those two things, as there are now adayes among catholik doctors about a thousand others, it is a sign that those two points did not belong to their Catechisme of faith, then assuredly known, but only to scholastical Theology, especially sith they had neither clear scriptur or general council, nor assured tradition for either side.

And it is of no moment, that som of them should be so confident of their opinion, as to think it to be a right firm Christian beleef. For I have heard my self, many a school Divine in catholik countreys, to say of his *Thesis* or school position, the better to countenance his own divinity, that it was either faith or very near it. Besides I do not know, that the present Church hath ever declared, in any cannon of her faith, either that the faithfull shall not reign upon earth a thousand years with Christ, after dooms-day: or that we may not communicate the Eucharist to children; although

though this last is declared not necessary.

*His 10 ch. from page 169. to 180.*

Is against prayer for the dead and Purgatory. Where, both by the testimonies which you, Sir, do cite in your book, and by the authorities he brings himself, Mr. *Whitby* acknowledges that praying and offering for the dead is a very ancient and general custom amongst Christians. Nay, that S. Paul himself prayed for his deceased friend Onesiphorus: This I say he plainly grants p. 182. But he addes, that *all this does not infer Purgatory, or that Purgatory is a place under ground near hell, where is fire and darknes, or that all are in pain and torments there.* And so he pushes to the end of his chapter; acknowledging faith, and denying only theology. For whether Purgatory signifie any one place, as our imagination is apt to fancy, or only a state and condition of som souls departed out of this visible world, I see Mr. *Whitby* understands not; that it is no Christian faith, but a meer scholastical divinity. But that our prayers, offerings, penances, and good deeds, do benefit the souls deceased; this the very testimonies cited by Mr. *Whitby* himself, as they do sufficiently convince, so do they confirm catholick faith, though they touch not upon theology at all. And while he oppugns the divinity of som catholicks, he establishes the catholick faith of all Divines.

In

In the interim he ought to remember, although in this he often forgets himself, that by the very testimonies, not only which you Sir do bring for Purgatory, but those also which Mr. *Whitby* has against it, we may see manifestly, that our Protestant Church hath much swerved from the ancient primitive practice of former Christians. For Protestants have neither priests, nor altars, nor offerings, nor sacrifice, nor satisfactions, nor expiations for the dead, which those authorities speak of.

*Ch. II. from page 188. to 203.*

The real presence under the elements of the Eucharist, Mr. *Whitby* here will not by any means endure. And he hath one shield of a word, which consists of almost as many syllables, as *Ajax* his buckler of bulls hides, to repell all authorities that may witness it. *Representatively*, that is the word. Thou seest, saith St. Chrysostom, upon the altar the very body which the wise-men saw and worshipped. *Representatively*, saith *Whitby*. Again, The most precious thing in heaven I will shew thee upon earth, saith the same father. It is *shewed representatively*, saith *Whitby*; it is seen representatively. I dare not adore the earth, saith St. Augustin, and yet I have learned how the earth is to be adored; because flesh is of the earth, and our Lord gave us his flesh to eat, which no man eats except he first adore. *It is Christ*, saith *Whitby*,  
who



*who is adored representatively.* And if any words will not bear that distinction, then are they all spurious. Nay, if any should say expressly, that not only Cbrist in heaven, but his very Sacrament is worshipped, this man will tell us presently, who hath as many shifts in readiness, where one will not serv his turn, as Achelous had to slip out of the hands of Hercules, that *προσκύνω* and *adoro* have other significations.

But he has, poor man, no very good memory. For after he had in this one chapter, spent many of his pages, to show that the real preience was not the former faith of Christians, and that they never adored the Eucharist, he lets fall a word by chance in the very close, which spoils all; by giving us to understand, that this was so universal a beleef and practis among Christians, that it came even to the notice of Infidels; and that it was withall of so great concernment amongst beleivers, that it expressed their whole religion, as the abridgment of their faith, and great capital work of their devotion. *Quandoquidem Christiani adorant quod comedunt, sit anima mea cum Philosophis.* It was the speech of Avicen, saith Whitby, although I think it was Averroes, who well enough understood both of them the natur of Cbristian religion, not only by what they saw themselves, but what they had read from more ancient writers, both  
Chri-

Christian, pagan, and Mahometan up and down the world, concerning the religion of Christians. *Since the Christians worship that which they eat, saith that Infidel, let my soul be with Philosophers.*

*Ch. 12. from page 203. to 218.*

Labours much for the general use of the Cup in all Communions. But neither does Mr. Whitby, nor can he distinguish, as appears by his discours, wherein he sayes, that *otherwise ther would not be a representation of Christs death*, which is the wisest word he speaks in all this whole chapter; I say he knows not, and cannot distinguish, that ther is in that one Eucharistian liturgy a double action, the one of sanctifying and offering to God, the other of giving or communicating to the people. In the sanctifying and offering of the sacred simbols does only the sacrifice, which is a representation of Christs death, consist. But the communicating of these simbols to the people, is only a consequent of the former, and no formal representation of our Lords death at all. But he does not know, and you need not heed what he sayes.

The concomitance of our Lords body and blood, where ever it be in any one or other of the species or simbols, which may enough justify communion in one kinde, he tells you very roundly, *it is a figment*. But if he had heeded the very practis of his own Church, which  
indeed

indeed he never does, he would have forbore those words. For when the Protestant minister gives the people first the bread, and sayes, *Take, and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed upon him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving*; Do not the ministers words there imply a concomitance before the cup come; even as perfect a concomitance, as you Sir can plead for? I think they do. For surely they intend not, to feed only upon one half of him.

*Chap. 13. from page 218 to 230.*

Declares, that alms-deeds and preaching of the Gospel is a sacrifice. But the Eucharist he will not allow to be any true sacrifice at all. Although to put by your arguments and solid reasonings for it, he grants it may be called a *Symbolical* sacrifice. And so he has caught hold of another distinction, which runs quite through this matter; or rather put the same distinction into other characters. And if any ancient writers, as ther are enough, do give testimony, that our Lords body and blood in the Eucharist is offered, immolated, and sacrificed on Christian altars, by the priest, for our attonement; *It is to be understood*, saith Whitby, *to be offered symbolically*, immolated symbolically, sacrificed symbolically, figuratively, significatively, representatively. And though you beat his head never so much with your authorities and reasons, so long

as *symbolically* remains there, you do but beat the air.

But where are any altars in our English Churches, or any sacrifices offered, or immolated thereon? And how comes it to pass, that all these hundred years of our separation from Roman unity, our people have never been told, that they have priests still amongst them, and altars, and sacrifice, although they be but *symbolical* ones; *symbolical* sacrifice, *symbolical* altars, and *symbolical* priests. For sacrifice is the very form and essence of all religion. And they that know so much, would have been much satisfied, to hear, that they have yet a sacrifice, at least a *symbolical* sacrifice amongst them. I will be bold to say, that not one man of a million has ever heard of any such thing in an English pulpit, or ever read it in a catechism. The minister of the word and word of the minister, that is all we ever hear of. But it is thought perhaps, that *symbolical* Priest would make but a jarring sound, like two voices in a defective octave, which have a semblance and shadow of a perfect concord, but coming short of it, produce the harshest and worst of discords in our ear.

That our Lords death upon the Cross was a true and real sacrifice to God for mankind, all Catholics know well enough, and our Ministers need not put them in minde of that, which  
already

already they believ. But as the sacrifices of the old law were instituted by almighty God, to be often iterated, before the passion of the great Messias, for a continual exercise of religion, in order to his future death: So did the same Lord, for the very same purpos of religious exercise, institute another to be iterated after his death, unto which once past, it was to have reference, as the former had a relation to the same death and passion when it was to com. And this the very gospel, if we would but understand it by the ancient practis of the Church, which interprets all written words, sufficiently declares.

And though this great sacrifice be exhibited in Eucharistian species and symbols, yet do all Fathers and ancient Councils speak clearly, that it is a real, true, and propitiatory sacrifice, though accompanied also with a figur; and not only a figurative and symbolical one. A child may be the figur of his father, and yet is he not rightly said to be only a figurative and symbolical child. A sacrifice only symbolical, a figurative altar, and representative priesthood, make only a symbolical, figurative and representative religion.

*Chap. 14. from page 230 to 247.*

Rejects images and sacred figures, as both useles and sinful: And Mr. *Whitby* seems here (good Sir pardon me) to have got indeed a real

vantage over you. Doubtles you were somewhat overseen, when you wrote in your book, most advised in other things and serious, these ill pondered words to Protestants. *Were there represented to any of you, thinking of other matters, a pictur of our Lord hanging upon a Cross, could you possibly avoid the calling to mind, who our Lord was, and what he hath done and suffered for you? &c.* And again, *Ask your heart, and you will find, that you would not place St. Peters pictur or the Kings in an unclean place, &c.* I say you are to blame, Sir, to think men of that way so scrupulous, or prone to devotion. For *Whitby* confutes you by an evident demonstration. *Alas,* quoth he, *I see every day Crucifixes in our Colledg windows, and yet never find any such effect wrought in me, as you talk of.* Indeed neither those Colledges, nor windows in the colledges, nor Crucifixes in the windows, were ever set up by their good Catholik founders, for any such students, as *Whitby* is, who findes, it seems, no effect wrought in him there, by the sight of any thing, but his good chamber, distributions, and dinner provided for him in the hall.

So likewise the connatural respect you plead for, as due to figures by force of their representation of respected persons, by an example of a Kings pictur, he confutes it nimbly. *I would not fear,* quoth *Whitby*, *to tear his Majesties picturs, which somtimes may be found in smoaky*

*Alc-*

*Alehouses, &c.* he puts them in smoaky Alehouses, the better to cover his own rudenes; nor would I scruple, sayes he, to put a piece of Popish Mass, wherein were haply an Epistle or Gospel ex-  
tant, unto an unclean use. And here also, he puts the Gospel in a Mass-book, as before he set the Kings pictur in a smoaky alehouse, to prevent offence, that som tender one amongst themselves, might take at his uncivil talk.

In brief, he will not allow any figur or image, though it were a Crucifix, to have any influence upon our minds unto good thoughts, any more then the pictur of Bradshaw or Cromwell, bell or the devil. Sometimes he sayes they caus bad thoughts; but never any good ones. And yet he addes, that Protestants do keep up picturs notwithstanding, though the cries of fanaticks be never so loud against them, because of the historical use they have. What historical use can they have, in the name of God, if the sight of them, as Whitby himself here speaks, can bring no part of sacred history to our minds; nor the very Crucifix have so much influence upon us, as to mind us who our Lord was, or what he hath don or suffered for us, ? Unles he will say, according to his usual method of answering, that they bring into our minds the history of the civil wars betwixt Cesar and Pompey. But surely, if these kind of sacred images and figures caus only evil thoughts, and no good ones, the



cry of fanaticks against them, notwithstanding any historical use, which according to *Whitby*, although he talk of it, is none at all, will not be judged unjust.

In conclusion he will needs have the Papists both to worship their Images, and pray to them. And this, because they use them commonly in their Oratories, whither they retire from places of worldly busines, to recollect themselves, and pray, when time and devotion invites them to it. But if for this the Papist must suffer his doom, what will *Whitby* say, when he shall be accused himself, for worshipping the roof and rafters of the Church, towards which he casts up his eyes, when he stands in his pulpit to pray, before and after his sermon. Even the poor Jews were derided by the Roman Satyrists, as adorers of the Welkin and clouds. And who can escape the censur, whether he have som pious representation before him, to fix his fancy, or turn only to the wall and stones. He must still kneel before somthing, whether he be within door, or without in the open air. And if he have the assistance of his crucified redeemer represented before him, it is probable enough it may help to recollect his mind, to humble his spirit, and fix his fancy; at least it can do no hurt. And if I may and needs must frame an idea or pictur of him in my mind, why may I not have it in mine eye too?

But

But Mr. Whitby will have it, whatever you, or the whole world knows to the contrary, that *Papists pray to pictures, and consequently make a God of them.* And he will not have them any more excusable, than those *Israelites who worshipped God in a Calf.* Here Sir I learn what I never knew before, that the idolatrous *Israelites* worshipped God in a calf. He that shall worship a calf for God, I could never in my life yet conceive how he should worship God in a calf. Moses worshipped God in a flaming bush. And why? Because God was by a peculiar presence in that bush or flame, to terminate that worship. Nor was he blamable in worshipping God so present there. But God was not so present in that golden statue of the molten heifer, which the Hebrews had set up in Moses absence, as the very God which brought them out of Egypt, that they could be said to worship God in it. And if he had been so present in it, they might surely as well have fallen down before him there, as any where els. The heathen, whom the holy Prophet rebuked so earnestly for worshipping the stars and host of heaven, did they also worship God in the stars or heavens? surely then they were not blame-worthy. Where ever God is by a peculiar presence, as in heaven and Moses his flame, there may and ought he to be worshipped. And so Christians worshipped God even in the man Jesus, our great and blessed Lord.

But his figur or effigies has no more of Gods presence in it, then the wall it hangs upon; save only the reflection of his outward effigies, to recollect the fancy. And the respect, if we will speak properly, does not terminate upon the pictur, but upon the person whom it represents; which infers a worship of God in it, not by it.

*Chap. 15. from page 247 to 273.*

Is very earnest for scriptur and liturgy in a vulgar tongue. This plea of Protestant ministers makes a plausible sound. And they know it well enough. For it was the first thing that by their rhetorical colours cast upon it, commended them to the people, after the Apostacy of the first reformers; by whose perswasion, the people was then made to beleev, they should now be as gods, all of them, knowing good and evil. *The word of God, saith Whitby, is kept from the knowledge of the vulgar people in the Roman Church.* And thus they all say and ever will say; be they never so much satisfied by Catholick writers to the contrary: becaus it is to their own advantage it should be so thought in England, and all other places, where Protestants have invaded, and now actually sit upon the Catholick Clergies benefice and byshoppricks.

But is ther any part or particle of Christian faith or religion, or of the word of God, that

is kept from Catholiks, or not made known to them, in Books, Catechismes, Sermons, all in their own language, and in daily practis of that Church, wherof they are members? Do they not hear, and read, and see all the mysteries of our Christian faith, Christ our Lords birth and passion, resurrection and ascension into glory? what he acted, what he suffered, what he taught, what he constituted and ordained for our salvation; what we are to hope, what to beleeve, what to practise in order thereunto, set before their eyes, not only by continual sermons, made to them, all over the catholik world, in their own vulgar tongue, but by their Gospels and Epistles, which they have lying by them, collected for the cours of the whole year, and translated into their own language, together with several pious treatises, and meditations upon all these rules and mysteries of faith, unto so ample use, that if they do but walk accordingly, which is all that religion intends, they cannot miss salvation. Is not all this Gods word? It is nothing els. And what is ther more of the word of God, except we will count letters and syllables? The word of God then is not kept from the knowledg of the vulgar people in the Roman Church.

But *why have they not the Bible translated, as it lies, in all languages, where catholik faith is profest?* Becaus it is obscure as it lies, in that short  
and

and ambiguous phrase; and under so many several tropes of rhetorick; and schemes also of logick, wherein it was wrote, apt therby to be perverted and misunderstood, as we see by experience to be true, unto endles factions. Nor does the word of God consist so much in letters and syllables, as in the marrow and meaning of his will. And not the sence and meaning, but the letter of the scriptur is that which makes hereticks.

But is not that the word of God which is kept from the people? It is the word of God, but not kept from the people. For it is but the same with that, which is delivered and made known unto the people. So much as it contains, whatever it be either of faith or morality, either of what is to be beleevd, or hoped, or practised, they have it all; but disintangled from those artificiall schemes of logick and rhetorick, wherof the holy writ is fuller then any book was ever writ by man, which there inwrap and render it obscure. Ther is no instruction, no rule of piety, no particle of comfort, either for this world or the other, in St. Pauls epistles, for example, but Catholiks have it; they read it in their own language, if they be able to read, they know it all. And they have it in a better and more facil manner, then they could find it out, by perusing those high theological discourses of his, which the learnedst of men can hard-

hardly, and very hardly understand. The like I say of other portions of holy writ. Only the disputative part, with the interwoven systems of rhetorick; this may exercise great and more sublime divines, who by help of their various litterature may consider; not only the plain truths therein contained, which are common to them with other vulgar beleivers, but the nature of the Metonymies, Synechdoche's, Metaphors, together with the several modes of argumentation, refutation, objections and inopinate transitions in the context. This, if my adversary OeN had understood, it had saved one fourth part of his *Animadversions* upon *Fiat Lux*; and *Whitby* here had been utterly silent. But it is their only advantage both in this and other controverted points of faith with Roman Catholiks, either to be ignorant, or dissemble their knowledg. And therfor I have good reason to think, they will never seem to understand. But God grant they may.

The wonder is, that English Protestants should still be as fiercely eager in this point, when they write controversies, as ever they were; when they do themselves most heartily repent, (I have heard several great clergy-men amongst them speak it) that they had ever given the Bible in that short ambiguous phrase it is penned, into the hands of people in their own tongue, to be thus perverted, as it is, every one his

his own way, unto endles and irreconcilable schismes. It would glad their hearts, no doubt, to see the Roman Church do indiscreetly as they have don. But that will never be.

Holy catholik Church has revealed, translated, and several wayes made known the will of God to her people, appointing most divine wayes and methods, such as she had her self received from God, to inure and keep them in the practis of that their holy faith. And the disputative and sublimer divinity, or, as I may so speak, the philosophical part of holy writ, such as can may read on Gods name, and the Church will commend them for it; while these, with all the rest, attend unto those duties and good works, every one in his calling, which their holy faith prescribes.

These are and ever were the wayes and method of the now present and ancient catholik Church, most wise and holy. And her subjects and beleivers have profited therby, many thousands of them, unto angelical sanctity; and all of them unto something more, than otherwise they would have had: whilst others that swerv from these wayes, promote themselves unto wildness and schisme without end, missing indeed the word of God in the very scripture they read; and never attaining to the true life and power in that form of words, which they use not, unto intended sanctification, but by their own  
mis-



misinterpretations wrest and deprave daily unto their own destruction. Nor will people be ruled now by their ministers, but thinking it their own right to interpret as they pleas, make it their only work to read, and cant sentences, and coin opinions as they list.

Excepting only this one fruit of our vulgar reading of scripture, as it lies, which in all mens judgments is an evil fruit, I do not see, nor can I know, what our Protestants can have, if all other things were equal, above vulgar Catholics by their scriptur translated, as it lies, in its own phrase. Do they know any more of the mysteries of salvation, Sacraments, or hopes of a life to com, or sincerity of a pious life, then the other? I am sure they do less, whatever they know, and are so taught to do. Or does any Protestant, after he has read a chapter, know any more of what is expedient for salvation, then before he began it. *It renews*, you will say, *and moves devotion*. Devotion to what? Are they not taught by the Reformation, that the good works there commended to our practise, are all mortal sins? And therfor do our people so read and hear, that in hearing and reading they wholly acquiesce, and trouble themselves no further. And they do wisely in it. For who would chastise his body, or mortifie his appetites, or give alms, and sin so many wayes, with so much expences and trouble, when he

he may as well do nothing, and sin less. And do not the sacred gospels, which Catholiks read in their own language, with pious meditations annexed for that very purpos, which also they are taught to read for no other end, move devotion too? And this I judge to be right piety. Whereas to read, only to say that I have read, or to find out new ways, or strengthen my self therein, is but vanity and sin.

After a duty is once known, Catholiks conceive then no further thing remains, but only their corresponding practis, which is with all their forces to be put in ure, according to the dictates of that their rule of faith, now sufficiently understood, unto their sanctification and merit. Whilst others think nothing behind, but only to read over again what they knew before, that they may have words in their head to talk of. Which of these is right Christianity, he knew well enough who said, *Fidelis sermo, & de his volo te confirmare, ut curent bonis operibus præsse qui credunt Deo*: It is a faithful saying, and of this I would have you to be strongly confirmed, that such as once have beleev'd in God, attend unto good works: These things are good and profitable to men, but other questions, controversies, and contentions, (which are the only fruit of our vulgar reading of scriptur in its own short ambiguous phrase) these do thou avoid; for they are useles and vain.

vain. This is St. Pauls mind, and I think he had the Spirit of God in him.

As for the sacred liturgy which Mr. *Whitby* would also have in a vulgar tongue, if he knew what the *Messach* or *Catholick Liturgy* is, which here I do not intend to teach him, he would know that it could no more be understood in English then in Hebrew, Latine or Greek. For in it the Priest does but offer and pray submissively for the peoples attonement, unto him who equally understands all languages; and people offer with him, as they are taught, and know well enough to do, all their several necessities, either with words or without them, in the mediation of his blood, who reconciled the world in his flesh to God, which reconciliation is figured and repeated in their *Messach*, for their religious exercise and comfort. And the great capital work of a true religion ought to be common unto all, not to those only who hear, and speak, and see, but even to the deaf and blind and dumb; how ever these may fail in other, inferiour and less necessary duties.

*Coloss. Ch. 16. from p. 273. to 369.*

Maintains very stoutly, first, that the *Saints* and *Angels* of God do not pray for us in heaven, either in general or in particular: Secondly, that they do not assist, help or protect us by their presence on earth. And thirdly, that to trust to any such help, is to rest in them, as our final end, and to make them

them our Gods. Though the two first be as much dissonant to any true religion, as the last to reason; yet will Mr. *Whitby* hold them all three. And he has an evasion for any grounds or reasonings you or any Catholik can make; an evasion at hand as smart and senceles, as any of those he gave before against Supremacy, &c.

But this your catholik doctrine about Angels he butts and runns at it, with most frightful and horned dilemma's. So many millions of Angel-guardians, quoth he, if for example upon the festival of St. Peter, they go up to heaven to St. Peter with their pupils prayers, who guards their persons? And if they do not go up, who presents their prayers? Again, When, saith he, these Angel messengers com so many thousand of them at once to tell the Virgin Mary of her new suitors, how can she have any quiet to say her prayers? And if she say her own prayers quietly, how can they tell her continually of so many new suitors? Again, Have all the houses in London, and all the Papist houses in Rome, so many Angels as will guard them, and keep the Devil from setting them on fire, or not? If they have, then are the Angels finely employed: If they have not, why doth not the enemy set a fire on them every night? Again, Had Jobs cammels, oxen and asses ther Angel-guardian, or no? If not, why then did Satan complain he could not com at them? If they had, then must we allow our Author Mr. *Cressy* one. Is not this notable divinity?

Surely

Safely Hudibras was but an ass to *Whitby*. This, this is the man of whom the poet sings *Canto i.* This is he, *In school divinity as able; As he that height irrefragable, A second Thomas; or at once To name them all another Duns.* But all this countrey divinity Mr. *Whitby* gathered, I know well enough, à *sensibilibus*, from the nature and property of his serving-boy, who cannot go off an errand and stay too; cannot sup and blow together; cannot tell a tale and whistle both at once; cannot speak of Jobs asses, but he must remember Mr. Cressy.

In truth, though Mr. *Whitby* be thus extravagant; yet can I not perswade my self, that other graver Protestants are so likewise. For when Christ our Lord comforts his poor believers, and terrifies their oppressing adversaries, with this his divine ratiocination, *See that you do not abuse or condemn any of these my little ones. For I say unto you, that their Angels do alwayes behold the face of my Father who is in heaven;* he seems apparently to speak something, that serves directly for the catholik beleef, and is consequently against these three assertions of *Whitby* to the contrary. For those angel-guardians; whom our Lord calls *their angels*, the angels of his believers, and of his little ones, either they must be so perspicacious, as one way or other to see even in heaven, where they behold the face of God in glory, all the perfec-

cutions and necessities of them whose angels they are: or at least, whilst they are present on earth, with them whose angels they be, they must still see and enjoy the God of glory who is in heaven: Both these things are possible; and, whether it be this or that, they must needs be both so potent and good, as to be able and willing, when they see time, to assist and help them in their afflictions and need, whose angels they are, either by praying for them in general; or in particular, or by strengthening, comforting, protecting their persons. And lastly, poor man may comfort himself in this invisible assistance, whatever it be, and however it be wrought, without making those angels his gods, or relying upon them as his final end.

And all this must be intended by our Lord and Saviour in that his comfortable ratiocination, I should think, if it conclude any thing. If they be not there insinuated, it is very hard to say what it may conclude. If the angels do neither pray for us, nor any way assist and help us, nor we can without danger of sin rely on any such assistance, then surely to say, *Let none abuse my little ones, for their angels, &c.* would be a ratiocination as impertinent, as to say, *Let none abuse, &c. for the North and South poles are half the heavens distant*: and far more dangerous. For man could hardly be persuaded by such a speech, to put any trust in that distance of the poles,

poles, as here he cannot but be moved to take comfort in that acquaintance and nearness we have with angels, which any way to rely on, Mr. Whitby tell us, is to rest in them as our final end, and make them our gods.

I could wish Mr. Whitby would first consult his own reason, whether any way to rely on the comfort of second causes visible or invisible, infer necessarily, that we do rely upon them as our ultimate end, and make them our gods, as he affirms more then once in this his 16 chapter: And again, I desire him, that he would be more wary, and take heed how he speaks against the angels of God, and deride those hosts of heaven, in whom our Lord Christ advised us, if I understand him right, to take comfort; lest they strike him, as som others they have don, with sudden death. Poor Catholiks are yet in their pilgrimage and place of sufferance, who must therfor patiently endure all scoffs, contumelies and slanders, for their futur merit. But the Angels of God are in glory, and blessed, and therfor not to be blasphemed or mockt at by insolent dust; or their protection and assistance to be slighted.

What is the essence of Angels, what their presence, or how great their power, we cannot here under our thick corporeal veil conceive. They may, for ought we can tell, be as compleatly present all at once, both here on earth,



and heaven too, unto any effect of perceiving or operating, as a man is present within the four walls of his chamber. At least if our Lord whom we pretend all of us equally to beleev, hath so clearly allowed us, to support our selves in their assistance, however it be wrought, no man I should think, who bears the name of Christian, can with any modesty affirm, as *Whitby* does here, that they neither pray for us in heaven, nor assist us on earth; nor that we can any way support our selves in any comfort from them, without making them our gods.

*Ch. 17. from page 369. to 410.*

Is very bitter against the celibacy and single life of priests, and exclaims on the contrary, with very broad language, that you may see he is very sensible of what he sayes, against the uncleannes of the clergy, not excepting any, nor allowing so much as a possibility to do otherwise. *And I doubt not, saith he, p. 378. whether such advocates of Celibacy, as M. C. if strict inquiry were made, might not be often found where the Card. of Crema was.* Where that man was found, I do not know. In all likelihood it was in som place where Jobs asses use to graze, for he lately made you, Sir, one of them.

Good Sir, do not hate the man, as he deserves, but pitty, pardon, and pray for him. He has mocked away his own angel-guardian, and cannot therfor be civil towards men. Mr. *Whitby* under-

understands not the several wayes and means prescribed by catholik religion, as a preservative against the incursions of that, or any other sensual temptation. He is unacquainted either with their frequent fastings, or disciplines, or hair-cloth, or continual and hourly exercise of psalms, hymns, and canticles, which take up in a manner all the whole life of the Roman Clergy. That man who uses heartily such like exercises, commended by catholik religion, will easily subdue any whatever temptation, if ever it should assault him, as they know well enough who practis that their religion seriously, and prevent oftentimes its very assault. But if any will be so forgetful of his own welfare, as utterly to neglect those sacred means, he may fall deservedly into a lower religion, and become a *Whitby*. Ministers are either in bed with their wives, or thinking haply after one, when the catholik clergy, if they correspond with their duty and calling, are watching and saying their sacred mattins, which consist of many divine lessons, psalms, anthems, responsories, hymns, canticles, which put divine and spiritual thoughts into their minds. When ministers are feasting, they fast: When they are caressing their mistresses, these chastise their body with disciplines: When they, got out of their beds, are at their mornings draught, these are saying their Lauds and Prime, and devoutly disposing themselves by

prayer and meditation upon their knees, unto their sacred liturgy: When they are eating and drinking, and manning worldly affairs about their wives and children, these are at their Sext and None, and Vespars, and Compline, that they may fulfill their daily task of prayers and devotions to their Redeemer. I say no more, but of this I am and will be confident, that if Mr. Whitby had ever practised, or seen the lives and conversations of Roman Priests, those visible angels of God, or been otherwise acquainted therewith, he would not have so boldly affirmed as he does, even against the very tenour of gospel, (which saith, that some are made eunuchs by men, and some again make themselves so for the kingdom of heaven) that it is impossible to be chaste. Nor would he so universally calumniate all professors of chastity for the wickedness of some few, who have in some particular ages and places given offence by their evil lives unto Catholics, whose testimony Mr. *Whitby* uses against them. But commonly men judge of others as they act themselves. And he that keeps himself chaste, will in charity think so of other men.

When you say Sir, and all Catholics with you, that it is indeed a doctrine of devils both pernicious and false, to forbid marriage absolutely as evil and unlawful in itself, as did the Encratites, Montanists, Marcionites, and Manichees; but yet

yet relatively and upon som particular account may som persons notwithstanding be withheld from marriage for diviner purposes, as catholik Church uses. For so the women, which were particularly addicted to the service of the altar, St. Paul would have them to be elderly and mature, lest being young, they should grow wanton from Christ, and desire to marry. This distinction will in no wise serv Mr. Whitby.

For saith he *with his reverend Hall, the doctrine thus stigmatised by the apostle as the doctrine of Devils is in general of such as do forbid marriage, and not upon this or that particular account. And the act is all one whether the prohibition be relative or absolute, as poison is poison whether absolutely or conditionally taken.* Thus speaks Whitby with his reverend Hall, thence inferring, if I understand him, that it is as full and truly the doctrine of devils to forbid marriage to any one upon any account, of serving God more purely and the like, as it is to forbid it absolutely as evil and unlawful in it self; as poison, &c.

But is this true? Poison conditionally taken, or taken upon condition, either of a preservative against it, or of som disease, wherof it is a proper remedy, may not poison or hurt the man that takes it, but rather help perhaps and cure him. And if it do not poison but help, then is it no poison to him, but physick.

And do they forbid marriage as in it self

unlawful, who do relatively prohibit it? Or is it equally the doctrine of devils to withhold it, as unlawful to all, or only to some upon a special occasion? Do they condemn it in it self who withhold it in relation to some times or persons? That I may omit other several reasons, which may convince this assertion of folly and falsehood, how comes our Church of England to forbid marriage in Advent and Lent, and some other times of the year? Is not this a relative prohibition? And doth our Church of England therefore absolutely forbid it in it self, because she relatively forbids it? I am sure the prohibition is as much relative, to forbid marriage to all persons at some times, as to forbid it to some persons at all times. And if the doctrine be stigmatized in general, upon what account soever it run, then doth the Church of England hold and teach the doctrine of devils, when upon this or that particular account, she prohibits marriage, although she absolutely allows it, as the Roman Church does.

The rubrick of our English Church now put into our Almanack runs thus.

*Times prohibiting Marriage.*

*Marriage comes in the 23 of January, and by the 7 of February it goes out again until Low Sunday, at which time it comes in again, and goes not out till Rogation Sunday from that time it is forbidden until Advent Sunday. But then it goes out, and*

and comes not in again till the 22. of January following: All which in the phrase of Dr. Pierce and Whitby his champion runs thus.

Times commanding the doctrine of devils.

The doctrine of devils goes out the 23 of January, and by the 7 of February it comes in again; until Low Sunday, at which time it goes out again; and comes not in till Rogation Sunday; from that time it goes out until Advent Sunday. But then the doctrine of devils comes in; and it goes not out again till the 23 of January.

The same is also to be said about abstaining from flesh in Lent. For this prohibition is equally stigmatized by the same Apostle in the very self-same text, as the devils doctrine. And a dispensation to eat flesh in Lent, cannot be obtained in our Bishops Courts, without a sum of moneys; and generally to abstain from the doctrine of devils we give an angel, either a gold angel or a silver one.

Truth is; it is no devils doctrine or evil counsel to refrain either from flesh or marriage, or any way to bridle, and mortifie our carnal appetites, which our holy apostles have counselled us carefully to do, but a blessed angelical conversation. For the angels of God, saith Christ our Lord, do neither marry nor are given in marriage. And the flesh of bulls and goats neither doth God nor his angels feed on. And both the counsel and practise of Christ and his apostles lead

lead us that way. When the *Bridegroom is taken away*, then, saith Christ, *shall my disciples fast*; that is, they shall then enter upon their austerities of life after their solemn profession in Pen-tecost, which now in their noviceship I will not put upon them, while they are yet weak in faith. Unto those very same disciples he also perswaded continence and coelibacy, both by his own example and words of counsel. And devils are all friends to the contrary uncleannes and gluttony.

But why then are these two abstinencies so opposite both of them to the devils will and inclination, called by St. Paul *Doctrina demoniorum*; wheras devils were never known to move any man to those abstinencies, but rather to the contrary excesses, being enemies themselves to all cleanliness & temperance? Doth the devil approve of that which our Lord advises us to follow? Or does he labour to promote Christs counsel and practis? No, in no wise. But whatsoever he may pretend of good, he ever does it to some evil end, and for snares and subversion. He likes not of continence, he loves not temperance, he hates cleanliness. But so to praise that which himself indeed dislikes, and perswade men to beleev, that such an act of high vertue and counsel is also of such necessity, that no man can be a Christian without it. This is one of his demoniacal subtilties.

The



The Greek hath two several words to express those evil sprits in general, *Demonium*, and *Diabolus*, the one speaks his crafty subtilties, the other his malicious will. But we in English have but one, and it renders properly the last. For the old Saxons our forefathers called that evil spirit *Deuvill* or *Doill*, which relates to the will or practice. But *Demonium* or *Demon*, for which we have no English word, has a reference to the understanding, and to the perverting of it. And it signifies *intelligent* or *knowing*.

Now this doctrine of abstinence from meats and marriage as things unlawful, is called by St. Paul *doctrina demoniorum*, the doctrine of *demons*, or of those evil spirits, not as they are wicked practisers, but cunning seducers; not as they corrupt the will, but delude the understanding. They hate continence, and never have or will move any man towards it. But if under colour of its excellency, they could once persuade men to believe, that salvation is not possible for married people, as in primitive times of Christianity they did, then have they acted the part of demons or cunning seducers indeed, and brought much ruin and disorder and snares upon the Christian world, which, it is indifferent to them, what way it suffers, so it receives a damage.

This craft of *demons* consists generally in this, that to make themselves and temptations plausible,

ble, they still advance one ability or vertue, to depress another. In primitive times of the Church they exalted that of the right hand, to depress the left; in these later times they exalt the vertue of the left hand, to depress the right. Thus marriage is good, and continence also is good; they are both good: Nay S. Paul sayes, that continence is better, or the vertue of the right hand: For *he that is unmarried only cares*, sayes he, *how to serve God well, and pleas him; but he that is married is solicitous for many worldly affairs* concerning his wife and children, and so is *distracted and divided two ways*. To exalt then the one of these two, which are both good things, unto such a monopoly of goodness and excellency, that the other shall be thought unlawful and evil; this is *doctrina demoniorum*, the doctrine of demons, who were cunning seducers from the beginning.

Thus faith is good, and other works of piety, justice, and sobriety, unto which Christ and his apostles exhort us, are good also, and necessary and healthful. He therfor that so magnifies the one, as to evacuate the other, teaches *doctrinam demoniorum*, the doctrine of demons, who were cunning seducers from the beginning.

Meat is good, and fasting is good; good to eat with thanksgiving; and good in times and occasions to abstain. But that man, who so

ex-

exalts the one, as to exclude the other out of Christianity, is a seducer, and teaches the doctrine of *demons*. So likewise doth he, who either so highly magnifies free will, as to exclude Gods grace; or so defends grace, that he abolishes all concurrence of free will unto works of piety and merit, teach both of them equally the doctrine of *demons*, who were cunning seducers from the beginning.

In a word, not to mention more examples, wherein I might be copious, so to commend continence, as to make marriage unlawful, is the doctrine of *demons*, who were cunning seducers from the beginning. And so again, to set up marriage, as to teach continence to be both sinful and impossible, is the doctrine both of *demons* and devils too, implacable enemies both to truth and continence. And Christ is equally crucified between both the thieves.

Ch. 18. from page 410. to 420.

Begins to justify the departure or schisme of the English from the Roman Church, as good and lawful. For if *Schisme*, saith he, be a crime, it lies upon the Church, not which separated, but which gave the cause of separation, the Roman, not the English Church: Causal schisme, which gives the occasion, bears all the blame; but formal schisme, which separates from an offensive society, is an action of necessary vertue. Nor can there be, quoth he, any necessity of communicating  
with

*with others in wicked actions; but a necessity rather of going out of Babylon. Nor does every schisme turn the Church of Christ into a synagogue of Satan, but only schisme in fundamentals, which fundamentals, he saith elsewhere, are as clear and perspicuous to all men, as that twice two make four. These Sir be his capital assertions in this chapter, which how little they will serve his purpose against the Roman Church, he that seriously reads your book against which this reply is made, will soon perceive: But how much they will disadvantage him before the Presbyterian, Quaker, and other wayes here in England, who separating from our English Church, do thus justify their schisme, either by mincing the fault, or laying it upon her from whom they have revolted, it behooves him well to consider.*

*Ch. 19. from page 420 to 428.*

*Endeavours yet more to diminish the fault, and justify the secession. Schisme, saith he, that proceeds from weaknes, in persons that desire to know the truth, and endeavour after it, is free from crime. And again, External unity is not essential to the Church. And schisme that is contrary to that unity, divides not from Christs body in things absolutely necessary to be united, but only in things not so necessary, as in the same liturgies or ceremonies about matters not fundamental, wherein an union is neither necessary nor yet possible. This is, I am sure, the voice of a Presbyterian, and no Pre-*

Prelatick Protestant, as Whitby speaks himself to be. And if it be indeed the sence of our English Church, as her spokes-man here would make us beleev it is, then are surely our English Bishops in charity all obliged, earnestly to intercede with his royal Majesty, who for civil respects hath forbidden all meetings out of ordinary Churches and Chappels, that the poor Quaker, who endeavours after truth and light with an innocent and unfeigned heart, may be permitted for religious respects to meet at *Bull and Mouth*, and other such like places, where they may think fit, being now resolved never to resort more to Protestant Steeple-houses, or to any of their liturgies or ceremonies; which communion is neither *necessary* unto any unity, any substantial unity in Christs body, nor yet *possible*; that they may declare amongst themselves the sons of light, the power and truth in simplicity of heart, without impeachment of the wicked.

*Ch. 20. from page 428. to 448.*

Falls again to speak against *Infallibility*, which he had battered before in his whole 9. chapter of above 30 pages, and that with as much earnestness here, as if nothing had been yet said of it. But this chapter was written haply by som other hand, which knew not what the former had performed; till coming together both of the papers to the Press, it was perceived they might both pass.

And

And here all general Councils, and their determinations are disabled, as destitute of any assurance of truth. *Is this Infallibility*, quoth he out of Chillingworth, *in the Council alone, or Pope alone, &c. What shall we do, if they run counter, &c. To whom must we hearken when many pretend to the Popedom, &c. What if the Popes misdemeanour be the thing to be judged, &c. How can we be assured that any one is true Pope, not Symoniacally ordained, not illegally elected, not invalidly baptised, &c. which are, saith he, uncertainties propounded by Mr. Chillingworth; not possible to be resolved.* This kind of discours fills up this whole chapter:

By vertue of these uncertainties, we can never tell, whether Mr. *Whitby* be any minister or no; or whether he be a Christian, or so much as a *Whitby*. If *titulus coloratus* and moral evidence may not suffice us, we can be sure of no authority either spirital or civil in this world. And if any one should learn by this wise master, thus to except against the obliging power of acts and decrees of King or Parliament. *Is that power in the King alone, or in the Parliament alone, &c. What if they run counter, &c. What if they should not be rightly chosen, &c.* would he not talk as wise as this man and his little Doctor Chillingworth? It ought to suffice an honest man and a good subject, that an authority is set over him and peaceably accepted, whom he ought

ought indefinitely to obey, not only for wrath but conscience. It is not his part to weaken due loyalty with these seditious querks and quibbles, *Who can tell whether he be legitimatly begotten, or rightly baptised, or legally elected, &c.* Catholiks have as much ground for their obedience to civil and spiritual Superiours, as they have for their observance of their own natural father. And I think that is enough. If we had it not promised in Gospel as we have, that Christ would preserv his Church from failing and error; yet the very beleef we have in his divinity, would naturally infer such a confidence, as Catholicks have in the Churches truth.

But Mr. *Whitby* understands not in whom this infallibility does originally reside, as I perceiv by his fond interrogatories, nor consequently what it is. If he had ever had the happy hour to read the System of that learned Doctour *Franciscus Davenport*, by whose light I have lately, Sir, since your departure hence to Paris, sufficiently declared in our English tongue, all this whole busines of infallibility, he had saved a multitude of idle words drawn out of his famous fanatick Mr. Chillingworth. Catholik Divines may several wayes defend and declare this busines of Infallibility, as well as other points of religion, according to their several conceptions and abilities, and may go som of them



so far, as to defend even an intrinsecal inherent Infallibility either in the Pope or Council. And although this may suffer more difficulty then the extrinsecall one of Gods providence and guidance, yet do I not see how any one can disprove a possibility of it. However faith does not require so much at their hands. If God be but infallible, and Christ be true, the Church is safe.

Very many bitter books have been written against Catholiks and their religion, injuriously diminishing both them and it, upon the mistake of this one busines of Infallibility, perhaps a wilful one; two very lately by Mr. Moulin and Denton, to the great hurt and dammage of the innocent, if men beleev them. It is a very pious and good rule, that of the Canon and civil law, *Cum sunt jura partium obscura, reo favendum est potius quam auctori*. But I doubt much whether the people of England, who may read these invective books against Papists, follow that rule or no. *When the right of Parties is obscure, saith the law, the defendant is rather to be favoured than the plaintiff*. If it were so here, we should not have been by such bitter books, so highly incensed, as I see we are, against poor Catholiks; but against those rather who slander them.

Mr. Moulin would prove, that Catholik religion and not Protestancy, is guilty of sedition;

on; and he does it by *a relation of passionate words and actions of some Popes recorded in stories.* And this he takes to be a sufficient proof that Catholik religion is guilty of sedition. It were indeed to be wished, that all Popes words and actions were answerable to their religion and rule. But that is hardly to be expected in this world. The very place, and honour that has ever been given to that seat, is no small temptation of pride, or other passions incident thereupon into a mind not more then ordinarily furnished with all Christian virtues. But if we will beleev histories concerning them, we shall find no series or succession of men in any one place or dignity of this world, to have held forth so many lights of vertue, as that one chair hath don. And if som have been faulty, they gave no doubt much caus of grief or scandal, but none of wonderment to the world. They may surely fail in a greater temptation; since other Christians who have the same means of grace, do fail in lesser. But *Catholiks*, saith Mr. Moun-  
lin, *are bound by the very tenour of their religion to hold for good and justifie, all that any of their Popes have ever said or don.* This would be very strange, why so? Becaus, saith he, they beleev them infallible. Who beleevs them infallible? How infallible? that they can neither do nor speak amiss? Who ever thought that? *Infallible* is a word taken up lately by schoolmen, to

expres the sovereign power and indeficiency of Gods Church, and not any inherent endowments of a Pope, who is brought up when he is young, like one of us, in the Catechise and practice of Christian religion, and when he is ripe and placed by Gods providence in that supream chair is eminently to practise those holy rules, and carefully to keep and maintain that *depositum fidei*, the treasury of faith which he hath received; and if he fail therein, shall give an account and suffer for it in another world, as severely as any other for their faults: Nor are his words and actions a rule to other men of Christian religion, but Christian religion is a rule to him both for his actions and words. And all that Infallibility which Catholik writers, to expres more than one thing in one short word, make use of in their discourses with Protestants, is only an extrinsecal providence of God watching over his Church, to preserv the primitive apostolik spirit in her, and to keep her alwayes even to the consummation of the world from errour and deficiency, notwithstanding any opposition from without, or the misdemeanours of any one or other within her self; even the providence of that good God, whose property it is not only to prevent evil from the good, but even to work good out of evil; that his Church which he hath promised to preserv may be ever safe. And if ever this infallible providence do show it  
self

self, it must surely be then, when the ship is ready to be split by heresies and schismes, that rise from som violent spirits breaking unity with that body so dangerously, that Prelates are called together from all parts of the world as a help extraordinary, in a general Council to prevent the ruin. And this is that which Divines mean, when they say, that the Pope is infallible *in Cathedra*, in the Chair, that is to say, *in confessu Seniorum & Presbyterorum ecclesie*, in a general convention of Christian Prelates. So that Moulin speaks not one word to the purpose.

But Doctour Dentons book is not any such mistake, but pure malice. He intends to show, *that Papists were never punished for religion, but for treason*. And his book is altogether made up of several stories of men, Papists men, sent over hither from beyond seas, as he sayes, to kill, poison, and destroy people. Some, when they had read his book, took the Authour for a fool; but I heard afterwards, that he is Physician. And upon that account I had him excused. For if he be as bad at physick, as he is in affairs of religion, he had caus to be angry with them, who came hither from forreign parts, to take his office and employment out of his hands, kill and poison people. If the villains, who ever they were, had been only sent over to make folks sick, they had don him som service; but to

poison men, and kill them down-right, that may give the Physician a just cause of wrath against those intruding empyricks. He begins his book thus. *I suppose it is a matter of faith with all Papists, that the Pope is infallible, and that he can depose Kings, &c.* Thus doth that wise man open his mouth and begin his *Recipe*. Two things very seldom seen in any Academick conclusions, when students defend a whole body of divinity in the schools, but never delivered in Gospel or declared in Councils, or heard or thought of by any one Catholik in the world, as any thing of his religion, these Mr. Denton supposes to be matter of faith with all Papists. I would ask Mr. Denton, whether he thinks it a matter of faith among Papists, *That the earth moves*, or no. If one Catholik hold those two assertions, which in his sense I cannot tell whether any one do or no; I will be bold to say, a thousand hold this. The next book Dr. Denton writes against Papists, will haply begin thus: *I suppose it is a matter of faith with all Papists, that the earth moves.* And then he may go on with his moon-stories, and build castles in the air, and Dentonise, as here he hath done.

Ch. 21. from p. 448. to 456.

Allows that general Councils, although they be not infallible, are highly notwithstanding, both themselves and their decrees to be esteemed;  
pre-

*provided that they keep to Gods rule ; that clear reason be not against them ; that men of worth do not gainsay them ; and that their proceedings be legal. Not otherwis.* Thus he recalls himself and mends the matter. All these four things, if general Councils observ, they shall be observed themselves, notwithstanding they may haply be a company of bastards and buffoons, neither legitimately begotten, nor rightly baptised, nor validly elected, nor legally ordained. And whether these specified conditions be, or be not in councils and their decrees, every man, as Whitby here and several other places of his book speaks, is to judg according to his own pleasur and discretion. So that according to his rule, the discretion and will of particular men is the final resolv of all religion, faith, and practis. Whence it will follow, that if there be as many religions as men, they must be all good.

When you object Sir, that such a liberty as this will be destructive even of all articles, canons, and acts of Parliament, in order to our establisht Protestantcy or other affairs. To this Whitby replies according to his custom, very hotly. *Doth it becom a confuter of Mr. Chillingworth, saith he, thus to trifle ? Hath he not told you that others may make the same defence as we ? as murderers may cry not guilty, as well as innocent persons ; but not so justly, not so truly.* For Gods sake who trifles here ? when both Chillingworth

and *Whitby* too, had put into every private mans hand an equal power of judging, admitting or rejecting the decrees, orders, and laws of their superiours, he now distinguishes with *Chillingworth* his fanatick Master, that som do it justly and truly; others not so justly, not so truly. But who shall pass judgment upon the final and only irrefragable judg, or aver such a thing of any one, who hath an equal and unlimited power beforehand, to take and reject what himself pleases. Both truth and justice must solely be in his will, who may admit and refuse as himself willeth.

But the party now esteemed faulty will be meal-mouthed we must think, and not dare to say, he both truly and justly does what he does; or to affirm, that he uses his own discretion, in that which he takes or refuses by his own liking. The Protestant forsooth, separated from the Roman, both truly and justly: but the Presbyterian, Independent and Quaker, these refuse the Protestants communion, not so truly, not so justly, although they do it upon the same right and title, and by the same principles the other used himself, and allows to other men. The Protestant shall reject the Parliament of Prelates, who establish Catholik religion, and do it justly and truly, only for this reason, that they do it upon their own discretion; but another if he shall except against a Council of Lords  
and



and Commons, that shall set up Prelate Protestancy, although according to *Whitby* they be no judges of our faith, he does it not so justly, not so truly, though he do it by his own discretion allow'd him to be his final resolv. What is this but to do wickedly, and talk fondly? First to subjugate all degrees of authority to every mans judgment, as the final and last rule; and then to question that rule, which he made subject unto nothing.

But that we may understand what a worthy respect Mr. *Whitby* has for general Councils, he tells us here, *that it is neither impossible nor improbable that general Councils may erre. Nay our writers, quoth he, do not acknowledg generall Councils to be infallible even in fundamentals.* And *Whitby* writes, we all know by this time, what his writers writ before him.

I cannot but marvel at this his talk. For *Whitby* in several places of his book affirms himself, that fundamentals are so perspicuous and clear, that no man can be so ignorant, if he be not a natural fool, as to mistake therein. *We, saith he p. 104. distinguish between points fundamental and not fundamental. These are clearly revealed, and so of necessary beieef. And to determine their sence, there is no more need of a judge, then for any other perspicuous truth. What need of a judge to decide whether scriptur affirms that there is but one God, that this God cannot lye, that*  
*Jesús*

*Jesus Christ was sent by his commission into the world, that he was crucified and rose again, that without faith and obedience we cannot com to heaven. These and such like are the truths which we entitle fundamental. And if the sence of this needs an infallible judg, then let us bring Euclids elements to the bar, and call for a judg to decide whether twice two make four. So he likewise avers, p. 441. that fundamentals are as perspicuous, as if they were written by a sun-beam. He reckons not the Trinity amongst his fundamentals; perhaps he does not take it for one; or will have no fundamentals, but what are perspicuous.*

*I could make it easily appear, that even fundamentals have been denied; and that with as great reason, as any he calls otherwis, are denied now. But I must be brief. That which I here note is this; What is as perspicuous as a sun-beam, as certain as Euclids elements, as evident as that which is most clearly revealed, as notorious a known truth, as that twice two make four, so clear that there needs no judg to determin it; This the Prelates of the Christian world met together, which none but a natural fool can mistake, must not be able to discern. They and none but they, can erre in fundamentals.*

*And yet, which does not a little encreas our admiration, he acknowledges withall p. 439.*

*That*

*That general Councils have 1 a greater assistance of the Spirit of God, 2 greater means of finding out the truth, 3 better reason of discovering what is the opinion of the whole Church, 4 an authority delegated from Christ to decide controversies. After all this, and with all this, it is neither impossible with him, nor unprobable, that general councils may erre, even in fundamentals, which himself affirms as perspicuous, as if they were writ with a sun-beam, as clear and evident as that twice two make four. Prelates, Christian Prelates, these must be the only natural fools of the world.*

*Ch. 22. from page 456. to 465.*

*Descends to Patriarchal Councils, which saith he, may be disobeyed and rejected, because such conventions are fallible, and may obtrude heresies and unlawful practises upon the world; and that a judgment of discretion is to be allowed unto private men, whether they are to submit to their determinations or no.*

This whole chapter might well have been spared. For if a greater, much more may a particular and lesser Church obtrude heresies and unlawful practises upon men. But Mr. Whitby is desirous, that all should be made plain, and not any rub lie in the Presbyterian and good Quakers way, when he shall plead an excuse for his separation from a Metropolitan Church here in England, which he hath made with a  
judg-

judgment of discretion here allowed him.

*Ch. 23. from page 465 to 478.*

*Sayes that the Protestant never separated from the internal communion of the universal Church, which unity is only essential, but only from external union with som. And such an union external with any Church on earth, is no wayes necessary to any ones being a member of the Church.*

Why then is the poor Quaker so grievously persecuted, imprisoned, and beaten, only for separating from an external communion with other Protestants? Especially since he separates from it, for no other end, but to have the internal communion in pure faith, and light, and grace, and charity, more perfect. Let any man read the Quakers books, which are now not a few, and see if they speak not for themselves, as *Whitby* here does for his own caus.

But the profest errors of the Roman Church justifie the Protestant separation. And does not the Quaker justifie his separation both from Roman and Protestant too by the same argument of notorious abuses, errors, sins, falsities, disorders, superstitions, excesses, of ministers, priests, byshops, deanaries, chapters, lawn sleeves, universities and steeple-houses.

*Ch. 24. from page 478 to 494.*

Endeavours finally to justifie the English reformation upon the account, *that it was made here by the supream magistrate, who may reform the*

*the Church either with a Synod or without it.*

And that supream power I hope then may be permitted to set up the Presbyterian or Quaker, at least to give them freedom of Conscience, if himself pleas, without any bishops consent, no man daring to gain-say or murmur against it, which not a few do heartily wish to see in this Land.

*Ch. 25. with the Appendix, from p. 494 to 512.*

Prescribes conditions and forms of disputing and replying, with som additions to his former discourses.

Thus have you, Sir, the particular design of each several chapter of Mr. *Whitby's* book; the negative part wherof denies your Church, and the positive betrayes his own. Why he gain-sayes yours, it is not hard to read. But why he should so much endanger his own, I cannot so easily say, whether it be ignorance, malice, or necessity moves him to it. Surely no Son of the English Church, as *Whitby* professes himself to be, could thus open a gap for the incursion of all sects, who are now ready to swallow her up, if he be in sound senses, but he must either not have what he may, or not will what he should, or not know what positively he ought, to affirm and teach for her better preservation. This book of *Whitbies* can never bring any man to that Church; nor keep any in that is there. If an enemy attempt the subversion of a house, it may chance to scape. But  
if

if the owner and inhabitant begin once to pull it down himself, he that passes by may not im- probably conjectur it will not long stand. Well may the Church of England take up that heavy complaint against this her either ignorant or malicious son. *If an enemy had don me mischief, I could have endured it. And if one who openly hated had maligned me, I could have kept my self from him. But thou man! thou my intimate friend! thou my leader and acquaintance!* Thus unworthily to be betrayed by her own *White boy*, must be no small aggravation to the mothers sorrow.

I might easily gather out of *Whitbies* own words, consequently put together, a compleat play for all the several wayes that are now of late risen up against our English Church; even so compleat, that they never have nor ever need to say more. This sad fate accompanies erroneous wayes, that even in defending they destroy themselves.

If witty Presbyterians assisted him in his book, they did their own work not his. And if he did it himself by som Presbyterian principles, received accidentally from them, he hath don therby not his own work, but theirs.

Notable is this Gentlemans art in citing of authorities, which he does in most of his chapters, against the points of catholik beleef, which are either not expressed in his book, where

where they may be found ; or not there found, where they are exprest ; or expresse no such thing, as he cites them in his book to utter. I had in my chamber but one of those many authors which Whitby cites for himself : and I found in it all this to be true. But this Sir, to spare here partly the mans modesty , and partly my own pains and expence of time, I now omit. And indeed, what would it avail, to give you or the world to understand, that Whitby never read the authors himself cites, or understood not, or wilfully wrested them. Let him live and learn. And God give him grace to make use of his time, to his own advantage.

This thing I may assure you of, that Whitby is an enemy not only to Catholiks, but Protestants also of all profession, here in England : or if you had rather have me so speak , an equal friend to all. For he will not have the Church of Christ to be any *organical body*, as he calls it, or company of people linked together in Sacraments, lyurgy, beleef, and government ; but to be only such and all such people, who hold God and a life to com , and som other fundamentals, which he names not himself, all of them : and therfor, as I suppose, leavs unto others, each man as he pleases, to determin. Nor will he have men bound either to an internal beleef, or any exteriour conformity to any Church. This himself avers in many several places



places of his book, that we may not miss his meaning. This new way of his I think he borrowed of som French Hugonots. For all the wayes that be here now in England concur each one unto a body, an organical body; not only Roman Catholiks, but our English Prelacy and Presbyterians too. Yea, the very Quakers to my knowledg esteem none to be so much as Christians, who assemble not with them. And they have with them som ministers of the gospel too, though extemporary ones.

A wary reader may observ, by the sole mirror of this book of Whitbies, which is a collection of most of the chief authors that have written against Popery, since the Reformation, how unsettled all Protestants be in all the controverted points of religion, wherof ther is not any one by som of them denied, but is by som others of them affirmed. They know what Church to oppose; but how much of her doctrine they should evacuate, they could never yet unanimously agree, nor what answer to fix steadily to any Catholik ground.

He will find also amongst other things, that our present Protestants now adayes do generally swerv from the first reformers, almost in all points both of disciplin and faith; about supremacy, good works, free will, possibility of keeping Gods commands, the real presence, prayer for the dead, tradition, &c. which former

Pro-

Protestants for the first forty years would not abide to hear of ; but now they are all in a manner so allowed by most Protestants, that there appears little difference between their way and catholik faith ; but only, that this stands unchanged, the other may alter again to morrow. Indeed every Protestant writer is in one thing or other a new reformer, as Whitby is here. And every half-score years brings forth new scenes ; nor is there any now that heeds any Protestant writer that is gon, if he speak contrary to him ; though he were never so eminent, even in the very point and busines of Reformation. This is enough for Whitby.

I heard Sir above half a year ago, that Dr. Barlow had made ready for the Press another book of his own against Mr. Cressy : and therefore detained this my letter with me, till I might give you an account of his with it. Truly Sir, I watched as earnestly for it, as any cat watches for a mous. But it will not yet appear. In the interim, one Mr. Stillingfleet has lately written a great book against Popery, even so big a book in folio, that none may buy it, but only such as hate Popery more than they love sixteen shillings. And he also proceeds this new french Hugonot way, insisted on by Whitby. He is only for a Church diffusive, that holds fundamentals what ever they be, and makes no account of any Church organical. Wherby he  
utter-

utterly disables not the Roman Hierarchy only, but even our English Protestant Church and government; if men do but understand what he sayes. And yet this man is mightily applauded by our English byshops: which I cannot but marvel at; and do thence conclude, that they all begin now to think, our English Church it self, that it may be made good, must be pulled down. Councils he holds with Whitby, that they can have no authority to move our assent, although they be general, as ther has never been any he sayes, these thousand years. And what is ther then for Gods sake shall move the Presbyterians, Independents, and others here in England to approve of the constitutions and government of our English Church, set up by a far lesser assembly.

In a word, this whole book of Stillingfleets is a large discours against a Theological argument of some Catholik disputant. The argument it seems was this; *Christian faith cannot be divine, except it have its birth from an infallible proposer; and consequently the Church must either be infallible, or els our faith is not divine.* The answer of this argument is the very life and vitals of Mr. Stillingfleets whole book. That same argument of the Catholik Gentleman is indeed a pretty theological ratiocination: and Stillingfleets answer, evasions, and distinctions, both concerning the argument in general, and all the par-

particulars it runs into are not unwitty. But this is no part of our business. Alas we in our controversies about religion are not come thus far. Such a discours had been handsomly fitted to theologicall schools, and very proper amongst learned divines there: but here not so. What is it to our business in hand, whether faith can or cannot be divine, except the proposer be infallible, and as it were divine. This is a meer theological dispute. And he that answers Stillingfleets book, defends not faith immediately, but an argumentators syllogisme. Religion indeed, as soon as ever it is questioned or disputed, runs presently into Philosophy. And therein, if great heed be not taken, it is quite lost. And thence it comes to pass, that most part of our controversie books is about school philosophy and human reasonings. I blame not the Catholik Gentleman, who ever he was, for his arguing. Nor will Stillingfleet be blamed for defending his place. But I let my countrymen, spectators of the contest, understand, that in deed and truth, so often as we dispute, we are beyond the business. All writers of controversie speak more then faith, when they either defend or oppose it. And in reading controversies we see not so much the nature of the faith, as the wit of him who opposes or defends it; and so much this some times, that the other is nothing at all discerned.

This the world must know and understand well; or els they will be miserably mistaken, as indeed I see all men are. When two lawyers plead about a case of right, perhaps three hours together; all that three hours talk is not law, or the right they talk of, but only their ratiocinations about it. And such are all our controversies about religion. And he does best therein, who still puts his adversary in mind what is his talk, and what is the faith they talk of. But he that defends both of them equally, forgets himself. And thus I see that generally men do miscarry on both sides: the Protestant by calling that Romanish doctrine, which is but a Catholiks discours for it; and the Catholik by maintaining that talk of his, which it is not a pin matter whether it stand or fall. For faith is firm and constant, though all my talk for it be miserably weak.

Now all the whole busines of faith, which Stillingfleet and his adversary talk of, is, as I take it, only this; *That the Church of Christ hath by Gods divine promise of being ever with her, a power to oblige her subjects to hear and obey her, if they mean to be happy in their way.* The Catholik affirms this: Stillingfleet with his Protestants deny it. And this is all the faith that is in it; which is not here touched. And a theological busines of Intallibility only spoke of. And therfor Stillingfleet is much to blame, when he  
speaks

speaks so often in his book, of the *Romanists way* of resolving faith; the *Romanists arguments* for their faith; the *Romanists doctrine* about infallibility not divine, but as it were divine; the *Romanists tenet* about fundamentals; the *Romanists motives* of credibility; the *Romanists doctrine* about the material and formal object of faith, &c. For all this and several such like talk is but the theological discours of that Catholik Gentleman, and of it self no *Romanists doctrine* at all. For I know well enough what *Stillfleet* means, and would have meant by *Romanists doctrine*. And all his Protestant readers understand thereby only Catholik religion: and he knows it well enough.

I should take it ill and be sorry, and look upon it as an injury to the Church of God, if any one should call my way of defending her faith, *the Romanists way*; or my talk, *the Romanists doctrine*: however the thing it self defended or excused by me is Roman or Catholik faith. The Church has no one way, but several methods, and several schools, and several wayes to declare and explicate, and defend her religion. And every writer does it according to his personall endowments and judgment; some better, some worse, though the religion so explicated, defended, and declared be still and ever, one and the very same. And if indeed I had been to speak in that business, I should never have made

any such argument as that Catholik Gentleman did: nor will another man think himself obliged to discours as I do, although he and I defend boeth of us the same thing. This if Mr. Scillingfleet consider as he ought, he will soon perceiv his own pittifal childishnes. But thus Doctour OeN dealt with me to my very great pitty and regret. Ever and anon, *Is this your Roman doctrin*, quoth he? *Who would have thought, that the Romish Church should dare to utter so wicked blasphemies*, &c. First misinterpreting my words, and calling that a doctrin which was none at all, but only a prosopopy of atheistical objections; and then stiling that a Roman doctrin, which was but the talk of a particular man. So that what he called Roman doctrin, and Romish doctrin, was neither Romish nor doctrin neither. But ministers care not what they say. And so much the more wary does it behove all men to be, who deal with them. Too much care cannot be taken with such men, who either cannot or will not distinguish between general faith and particular mens doctrin; between religion, and severall school-methods of defending it; between the faith of the whole Church of God, and discourses of writers concerning it. So ignorant they are all of them, or wilfully malicious. I find in my heart even a longing desire to expres to you in particular the various shifts and misdemeanours of  
 Stil-



Stillington. But here is now no time or place for it; and such a thing if it were done, would be but of little use to morrow. I mention him only, to let you know, how much the French Hugonot religion begins here to prevail by means of Whitby, Stillington, and others, to the overthrow of our own Protestant Church here established; and to let posterity, who shall haply see any of these small writings, have some little glimmerings of these our present times. They doubtless will be glad to see the general course of things now done, even as we are to read the wayes of former reformers: although neither we nor they can take any great pleasure in any long particular narrations of their fallacies either against logick or morality, when the men are once past and gone.

Dr. Jeremy Taylor hath also put forth lately a very bitter, insulting, injurious book against Catholick religion, which he calls a *Diffusive from Popery*. *Reddet illi dominus secundum opera ejus*. And God will bless his Catholick beleivers who trust in him, and walk according to their holy rule, in his fear and love, unblamable, the very contumelies of adversaries working at length to their greater good. And I beseech God, who revives all things, and Jesus our Lord, who gave his testimony under Pontius Pilate, a good confession, that they may ever observe the commandments of God, and the Church his Spouse,

possessing their souls in perfect patience, unrep-  
 rovable unto the coming of Jesus Christ our  
 Lord, whom in his own times will the blessed  
 God shew forth, the only potent one, the  
 King of kings, and Lord of Lords, who alone  
 hath immortality, and inhabits light inaccessi-  
 ble, whom no mortal man hath ever seen, nor  
 yet can see him; to whom be all honour, domi-  
 nion and power for evermore. Amen. This  
 is the earnest desire and prayer of

Sir,

Given in the Nones  
 of March. 1664.

Your real friend,  
 J. V. C.

EPL

# EPISTOLA

AD

## AMPHIBOLUM.

AGAINST

### Dr. Taylor.

---

The occasion of this Epistle.

**T**He first epistle was written to an adversary :  
the second to a friend : this third to a neuter ;  
who after he had began to think more moderately  
of Catholik religion, returned, upon his reading of  
Dr. Jeremy Taylor his Disswative from Popery,  
to his former misconceits. And he is by this Epistle  
given to understand, that the said Disswative is of  
that nature, that it can have no such force upon  
any judicious man.

Ser-

Sermo Horatianus inter Davum & Herum.

**P.** *I*amdudum ausculto, & cupiens tibi dicere  
servus

*Pauca reformido.* **H.** Davusne? **D.** Ita Davus,  
amicum

*Mancipium Domino, & frugi, quod sit satis: hoc est  
Ut vitale putes.* **H.** Age, libertate Decembri,  
Quando ita majores voluerunt, utere. *Narra.*

**D.** Pars hominum vitii gaudet constanter, & urget  
Proposuitum: pars multa natat, modo recta capeffens,  
Interdum pravis obnoxia. —

**H.** Non dices bodie, quorsum hac tam putida tendunt  
Furcifer? **D.** Ad te inquam. **H.** Quo pacto pes-  
sime? **D.** Laudas

Fortunam & mores antiqua plebis: & idem,  
Si quis ad illa Deus subito te agat, usq; recuses:

Aut quia non sentis, quod clamas, rectius esse:

Aut quia non firmus rectum defendis, & haeres,  
Nequicquam ceno cupiens eyellere plantam.

Non horam tecum esse potes: non otia recte  
Ponere, teq; ipsum vitas fugitivus, & erro.

**H.** Unde mihi lapides? **D.** Quorsum est opus?

**H.** Unde sagittas?

Aut insanit homo aut versus facit. Ocyus hinc te  
Ni rapis, accedes opera agro nona Dunano.



*Epistola ad Amphibolum, against  
Doctour Taylor.*

SIR,

**Y**OU were pleased to say, upon your reading of *Fiat Lux*, that Popery may, for ought you knew, be more innocent then commonly it is reputed, and no wayes so odious as some would make it. But now, upon the reading of Dr. Taylor's *Disswasive*, which you desire me to peruse, I perceiv you look towards your former thoughts concerning this maligned Popery, and invite them home again. To deal freely with you, I was amazed my self at the reading of that book, though not Sir with your amazement, but another of my own. You startled at Popery, whose ugliness was there set before your eyes with such fresh colours. I at those ugly colours which so injuriously defaced that Religion, that most innocent Religion, which under the name of Popery lies here traduced by the pen of her own ungrateful Scribe.

*Kai ou téxton!* What; Doctour Taylor against Popery? And such a *Disswasive* as this! But my amazement, Sir, is now blown over, The  
Doctor

Doctour appeared to me after some serious thoughts, to be for a special reason, that touches none so much as himself, in some manner excusable. That none should love Popery, or ever come to know it, concerns not only his wealth and dignity, and life of ease, which is the common caus of others also with himself, but all the honour and fame he hath hitherto got by transcribing popish, as now he calls, but in former times named Catholik, authors. For, having bin twenty years and upwards deeply plunged in reading and transcribing som of the innumerable spiritual books, that are amongst Catholiks, not only in Latin, but other languages of several Kingdoms where that Religion flourishes, he hath culled out thence many fine treatises, which he hath set forth in his own name and language, to his much renown, and no small wealth and dignity amongst us. Nor is it to be doubted, but that he means for his yet further glory, reaped from other mens labours, and that spirit of piety which thence he got into his own pen, to write out yet one book more. The same store-house that furnished him with the life of Christ, will dictate to him also the lives of his twelve Apostles, and many other raptures of divine love, and heavenly devotion. And if people be but kept from Popery, as he hopes and labours they may, it will never be known, whence he gathers those his fragrant pieties. It was

was not handsom, yet a piece of wisdom it was in the Grecian Cynick, to spit in the dish which pleased him best, lest others should taste how good it was, and deprive him therby of som of his content.

This book of Doctour Taylors called a *Disswasive*, printed in Dublin, and as I understand, reprinted here in London, (I suppose in the very same words by reason of the Authors absence) is large enough, containing 173 pages in quarto, marvellously bitter, and contumeliously insulting over that Religion, which he cannot but know he misreports. Indeed, Sir, there is more popery in one page of Dr. Taylors *Life of Christ*, which he transcribed from popish Authors, than is in all this whole book which he writes against those Authors popery: that is owned by them to be their religion; all this he puts upon them under the notion of popery, throughout his whole hundred and seventy three pages, except haply som three or four words, whose sence also he perverts, no Catholik upon earth acknowledges for any parcel of his faith. Is not this strange disingenuous dealing? How he comes to act thus, and what is the feat he makes use of, to discolour their Religion, you shall hear by and by, when I have first opened his book, and the things contained in it.

His *Disswasive* hath three chapters, and each chapter



chapter several sections. The first chapter is intitled thus ; *The Doctrin of the Roman Church in the controverted articles is neither Catholik, Apostolik, nor Primitive.* The second thus ; *The Church of Rome as it is at this day disordered, teaches doctrins, and uses practices, which are in themselves, or in their true and immediat consequences, direct impieties, and give warrant to a wicked life.* The third thus ; *The Church of Rome teaches doctrins, which in many things are destructive of Christian society in general, and of Monarchy in special : both which the Religion of the Church of England and Ireland, does by her doctrins greatly and Christianly support.* These three be things of importance, and must either be great notorious crimes in the Defendant, or monstrous slanders in the Plaintiff. A Religion that is new, impious, and unfociable ; that is against antiquity, piety, and society, is hardly good enough for Hell. Who is he that shall dare to profess or countenance such a religion upon earth. But let us see in order how all this is demonstrated to us by an old, pious, and fociable Doctour.

*His first Chapter.*

First then ; " That the doctrin of the Roman Church in the controverted Articles is " neither Catholik, Apostolik, nor Primitive, " he declares in eleven sections, which make up " that his first chapter. First section sayes, that " the

“the Roman Church pretends a power to make  
 “new Articles of faith, and doubtles uses that  
 “power, and for that end corrupts the Fathers,  
 “and makes expurgatory Indices to alter their  
 “works. The second, that this power of ma-  
 “king new articles is a novelty, and yet beleev-  
 “ed by Papists. Third, that the Roman doct<sup>r</sup>in  
 “of Indulgences is unknown to antiquity.  
 “Fourth, that Purgatory is another novelty.  
 “Fift, Transubstantiation another. Sixt, Half-  
 “communion another. Seventh, Liturgy in an  
 “unknown tongue another. Eighth, Venerati-  
 “on of Images the like. Ninth, Pictures the  
 “same. Tenth, the Popes general Episcopacy  
 “likewise. And the eleventh and last speaks al-  
 “most as many more all of a heap, to make up  
 “his one last section ; as Invocation of Saints,  
 “sufficiency of scriptures, absolving sinners  
 “before pennance, simple Priests giving Con-  
 “firmation, selling Masses for nine pence, cir-  
 “cumgestation of the Eucharist, intention in Sa-  
 “craments, Mass-sacrifice, and supper without  
 “Communion. All this is Popery, all new, and  
 “therfor the Roman Church is neither Catho-  
 “lik, Apostolik, nor Primitive. This is the  
 sum of his first Chapter.

What in the name of God does this Author  
 of the *Disswasive*, your learned Doctour, mean  
 by the *Church of Rome*, and by the *doct<sup>r</sup>in* of  
 the *Roman Church*? This Sir, is a main busines;  
 and

and ought, if he had meant sincerity, to have been firmly stated, before any thing were treated, either of the one or the other. But this he utterly here omits, which he should principally have heeded, that he may speak loosely and hand over head, any thing he may deem fit to black his own paper and other mens fame. If he take them as he ought; the *Church of Rome*, for that universality of Catholik beleevvers, who live in several kingdoms of the world united in faith and sacraments under the Spirit of Jesus Christ, and one visible Pastour; and the *doctrin of that Church*, for the body of faith and religion handed to them from age to age, as taught and delivered from Christ and his Apostles, which they call in the phrase of St. Paul *Depositum fidei*, or treasure of faith: I say if he mean this by the *Roman Church*, and *doctrin of that Church*, as he ought to do, I will be bold to aver, that ther is not any one claus or period in his book true, and three parts of his book absolutely impertinent. If he mean otherwis then Catholiks themselves conceiv or profess, he was bound in honour to make his mind known, that the renown of an innocent Religion, and worthy persons might not suffer prejudice by his ambiguous speech. But perhaps he studied how to abuse that Religion, that he may be thought worthy of the dignity and wealth he has now obtained in another, slipt out of it. But concern-

cerning the way he takes to villifie the Roman faith and Church, which is indeed the common road of all her adversaries, I shall speak more fully, if I have time, by and by. Now I hasten to his text, which I shall give, and my own judgment of it very briefly.

§. I. *Which is about Novelities in general.*

“ Sayes, that the Protestant hath the word of  
 “ God, and Gospel, and Apostles writings, and  
 “ if need be, the four first general Councils,  
 “ and cannot be therefore doubted to be Apo-  
 “ stolical; but the Roman Church cannot so  
 “ much as pretend, that all her Religion is pri-  
 “ mitive, since she pretends a power of making  
 “ new articles of faith: for Turretremata,  
 “ Triumphus, Ancorano, and Panormitan af-  
 “ firm she can do it. And this power Pope Leo  
 “ the tenth challenged, when he condemned  
 “ Luther for denying him to have it. To fur-  
 “ ther this their pretended power, the Papists  
 “ corrupt, and alter the Fathers works: inso-  
 “ much that Saurius the correctour of the Press  
 “ at Lyons, complained to Junius, that he was  
 “ forced to blot out many sayings of St. Am-  
 “ brose, which had been in a former edition  
 “ printed there. For this care of purging Ca-  
 “ tholik writers Sixtus Senensis commends Pope  
 “ Pius. Nay, they correct the very Indexes  
 “ made by Printers, as those of Probens and  
 “ Chevallonius.

Thus the Doctour begins his book: and I cannot but commend his wit. For he wisely assumes that to himself, which is the very one great busines, wherein every particular controverſie ſticks, and which, if it were once agreed on, would put an end to all controverſies, that either now are, or ever ſhall be in the world. For they all com at length to this queſtion, which of the many Profeſſours of Chriſtianity, now ſo much divided in their wayes, have the Goſpel and word of God on their ſide, in this, that, and the other particular. *We, ſaith Dr. Taylor, we Proteſtants have the word of God, we have the Goſpel of Chriſt, we have the Apoſtles writings with us and for us, and therfor our Religion is for certain, both ancient, primitive, and Apoſtolical.* This is, Sir, a very good conſequence. That Religion muſt needs be ancient, which hath God for his Author, that muſt be a primitive Chriſtianity which Chriſt founded, and what the Apoſtles writings confirm, muſt needs be Apoſtolical faith. But is it proved here by the Doctour, that Proteſtants and not Catholiks have the word of God and of Chriſt, and of his Apoſtles on their ſide? No, it is all ſuppoſed: and his whole endeavour is to tell us, that the religion which iſſued from God and Chriſt, and his holy Apoſtles, muſt needs be Apoſtolical, primitive, and ancient. He ſuppoſes Proteſtancy, as diſtinct from Catholik faith,  
to

to have com all of it from those divine hands, which is the only thing to be proved: and declares at large, that a religion which came from such hands, must needs be ancient and primitive, which is a thing no man can ever doubt.

It is certain and manifestly known, that Protestants received both Law and Gospel, and Apostles writings, from the hands of Roman Catholiks, who had kept and canonized, and lived by those rules fifteen hundred years before Protestancy rose up in the world, and all the whole hundred years since. The only question is about the sence and mind of that holy writ, in the many particular points now controverted in the world. He has the law, that has the mind and purpos and meaning of the law; not he that hath the form of words without it. This is the great business, and the very extract and quintessence of all controversies: which your quick Doctour assumes as granted on his side, without any more ado. *We, saith he, we Protestants have the Law and Gospel, and Apostles writings, and the old Councils too if need be, and therfor is not the ancientness of our Religion to be doubted. But the Papists! what of them? the Papists Religion cannot so much as be pretended to be Apostolical, old, or primitive. Why so? Have not they the law and Gospel, and Apostolical writings? He does not plainly say they have not, but he hopes his reader will think so. What*

then of the Papists? *They*, saith he, *can make new Articles, and therfor cannot their Religion be antient.* Sir, although they could make new articles, so long as they do not, their Religion may be old still for all that. A man may live in an old house, although he be able to build a new one. And this seems indeed to be the case here. For the Disswader in confirmation of his speech, brings in, although unjustly, the testimony of som Catholik Doctours, who should say, *The Church can make new Articles*; but not one that sayes she has made any. That I may yet go further; although the Church should make new obliging Articles: so long as these do not contrary the former, but declare them more amply in such and such circumstances, they annull not, but rather confirm and explicate the old ones. Is not our Law the same old Law of England, and we the same polity our fore-fathers were, although the King and Parliament upon occasion of new disorders, make new acts and statutes continually? But let us go on, yet one step more.

The Roman Church does plead, Sir, whatever your Disswader would have you think, that her religion is Catholik, Apostolik, and primitive: becaus all her Councils, by which that Church is governed, have openly and continually declared, when they came together to decide any affair which had raised new disturbance



in the Christian world, that they must firmly adhere to that which is Primitive, to that which is Apostolical, to that which is Catholick, to that which has been delivered and received from fore-fathers. And by that rule they decided the difference. How then can this Church pretend to make new Articles? Does your Doctour bring any General Conncel, which is the loud voice of that Church; or any Tradition, which is the Churches still voice, to speak it? No, not any at all. But this he ought to have done, if he would prove that Church to pretend any such power. What then? Wy, *Tur-recrumata* and som other doctours sayes, *she can do it*. But Sir, if some one or other clergy-man should think that the Church can make new articles, does it therfor follow, that the Church it self does pretend any such power. Surely the voice of one or two Ministers here in England cannot in reason be thought the voice of our whole Protestant Church, especially when they speak against the tenour of her doctrin and practice. But your Disswader has been many years picking in cobweb holes, and obscure writings, that he might, where he could find any halt sentence apt to be wrested from the common judgment of Catholick Religion, mark that out for Popery; to the end it may be thought either naught or new. This is the chief ingredient of your Disswaders Policy. Catho-

lik Doctours, Sir, though they may have written many other most excellent, catholik, and pious things, yet through humane infirmity, in this and that particular, may they at one time or other trip and fall. And particular mens failings are to be rectified by the straightnes and integrity of the General Canon; but they are not to be esteemed that Canon, as your Doctor Taylor, not inclined to mend things but marre them rather, would here have them to be, throwout this whole book of his Disswasive; where whatever he can read or hear of amongst the writings of any one in the Catholik world, that may either swerv or be wrested from the universal judgment and beleef of Papists, that he calls Popery: and what they speak, that the Roman Church must pretend. O the strange perversness and wickedness of mans heart! And yet this book of his thus made up, has carried away, not the weaker sort of men only, but it seems has made even your discretion, Sir, to stagger. For when I gave you lately a visit, I perceived within a while, that I had but gon forth to see a reed shaken with the wind.

What the Church can do, is but one of the Questions of School-divinity, and no Catholik faith: Consequently no Popery. And if two or three in the Schools should chance to aver this power in the Church, where more then two or three thousands deny it, why should not the

the opinion of three thousand Papist doctours be esteemed Popery, as well as that of only three. Whilst all of them agree in their faith, which is, *that the Church hath a power authoritatively to decide controversies*, and dispute only of a further power then their faith reaches unto, I should think, that the opinion of three thousand Papist doctours is rather to be esteemed Popery, if one of them must be called so, rather then the single opinion of two or three, if any such be to the contrary.

But truth is, ther is no such opinion of any one I know to the contrary. Nor does Turrecremata, nor any els teach, that the Church hath power to make new articles, in that sence your Dr. Taylor means, who therby would infer, that Catholik faith is therfor not primitive, but new. Nay, it is rather Popery, and a part of Catholik faith, that no new articles can be made. For General Councils have determined, that nothing is to be beleaved or held, but *id quod traditum est*, that which has been received from Christ and his Apostles. Nor can the Religion otherwise be the faith of Christ, or Christian Religion. Sir, if you do but seriously peruse the last one general Council, which all Protestants hold to be rank popish; that I mean which was kept at Trent: you will find that they testifie almost in every Session, and profes to make all their determinations according to

that which had been delivered, according to that they had received, according to that which had been conserved by continual succession, to that which was conformable to Apostolical tradition, to that which had been perpetually and uninterruptedly retained, to that which *ancestours profest*, to that which the Church of God ever taught, ever understood, ever beleaved, that which hath been received down by hands, that which was the ancient judgment, and custom, that which has been approved since the apostles dayes, &c. These are all the very words of the Council in several of their Sessions. And shall a Doctor Taylor com now after all this, and tell the world, that *Poperie is neither Catholik, Apostolik, nor Primitive, and that Papists pretend to make new faith, &c.* after a general Synod, which all Protestants look upon, as the most popish Council that ever was, and that too the last and nearest to us, hath so manifestly, so pathetically, so generally profest the contrary. What should we say to such a Doctor? And other general Councils in like manner, never determined any thing for the quieting of dissentions, for which end they met together, but what was latent at least in the seed of Christs word, and so no new article in this Doctors sence: as did that Council for example, which determined two wills in Christ, which was no new article, becaus the former old faith, which had made known two perfect natures in our Lord, the one

one divine, the other humane, apparently dictated that truth against all those, who would acknowledge but one will in him. And this being defined by the Council, received a new strength against a novel heresie, but not a new birth. For this cause Councils do not determine the varieties that are in Schoolmen; because these are superstructures, and none of them more latent in ancient tradition, than is the opinion that is opposite to it.

But *Turrecremata*, *Triumphus*, *Ancoran*, and *Panormitan* teach that the Church can make new articles. If they should say any such thing, I have already made it enough evident, that it cannot be thence inferred to be popery, or any part of popery. But what if they speak no such thing? What shall we think then of this your Dr. Taylor? *Turrecremata* in the place cited by him, never so much as dreamed, as any man may there see, that the *Pope is the rule of faith*, as the Doctour would have him speak: but in that whole chapter labours only to shew, that it belongs to him principally to *regulate* disputes in faith, as being the *chief* Prelate. In the like manner does he most unworthily abuse the other three, brought by him as witnesses, that the Pope can make new Creeds, and new faith: whereas *Panormitan* teaches expressly, that he cannot make, but only declare faith; *Ancorano* says the like, adding that what he so declares,  
may

may be new to us, though not in it self: and Triumphus no less manifestly speaks in the very place cited by him, that ther is one and the same faith in the ancients and moderns, and that in our holy Creed are inserted all those things, which universally pertain to Catholik faith: although he say withall, which is also very true, that to adde, explicate, or declare a truth, which is contained in holy Scripture, hath alwayes been lawful for the Church. But is this to make new faith which is not Apostolik, and primitive, as this your Doctour would have them to assert? Do you Sir, your self judg. And him that thus abuses the world, God Almighty judg. So that when we come to the close of all, ther is not any one Catholik Doctour, that ever said that the Church can make new articles of faith in Doctour Taylors sence.

*Why then did Pope Leo the 10. condemn Luther for denying the Pope to have this power? Neither did Luther, or Pope Leo ever dream of any such thing. For Luther wholly busied himself about his old Catholik Religion, from which he had revolted, which he called an Egyptian darkness that had overspread the earth even from the Apostles dayes, and never thought of this school question, which in his dayes was not heard of. And he denied the then present Pope who was Leo the tenth, to be any judg in those Controversies of Religion, or to have any power*

power *statuendi*, of deciding or determining in such affairs. Nor is ther any the least mention, either in Luther's resistance, or Leo his censure, about constituting new articles, but only deciding the old, which Luther would have thought to be erroneous, however strengthened by antiquity, and from which old errours he would make himself a reformation and innovation by the right, which was in himself not subjected to any man, no not to the Pope himself in those affairs. Is this a mistake think you in your *Disswader* or something wors? Truly I cannot think he was so ignorant.

The like insincerity doth this your *Disswader* exhibit in all that his talk of the Catholiks dealing with the Fathers works, and the indexes or tables adjoynd to them, jumbling his words so confusedly together, that his reader might beleeve that to be don to the Fathers writings themselves, which the Churches care provided to be done to the false glosses, tables and indexes annexed to those writings; and that to be taken out of those writings, which ever was, and still is in them; and Printers and Correctours complaining of that fault of making alterations in the Fathers Editions, which they did not so much as think of. Which is a most stupendious insincerity. And thus, saith he, *are the Fathers maimed and curtailed by Papists; in-somuch that Sixtus Senensis praises Pope Pius 5.*  
for



for this his care in purging the Fathers works. I say this whole talk of his is most prodigiously unjust. For that Index Expurgatorius extended not to any writings or works of the Fathers, but only to the marginal notes and false glosses and indexes or tables put to them by the hereticks; and therfor are Tertullian, Origen, and some others still printed intire, though ther be not a few things in them contrary to Catholik faith. And this the very words of Junius a Correctour of a Press cited by the Doctour clearly intimates. *What, saith he, Papists dare not do with the Fathers, they practise upon us,* he means Protestant printers and writers: *and with their little forks thrust out our annotations in the margent, and our sayings in the indices, although they be consonant to the Fathers minds.* But, saith he, *this care was so great in Pius 5. that Sixtus Senensis commends the Pope for his industry in purging the Fathers works.* He did so indeed: but if the Doctour had spoken out the sentence, he had betrayed his own false heart, which he would not willingly do. *Expurgari, saith Senensis, & emaculari curasti omnium Catholicorum Scriptorum, ac precipue veterum Patrum scripta, hereticorum etatis nostrae fecibus contaminata & venenis infecta.* Your Doctour our Disswader makes Senensis praise the Pope, for his purging the Fathers, as though he had scowred and scraped off the substance: wheras he commended him only

only for his care in cleansing them from the infectious notes and glosses superadded to them by the hereticks of our times.

But Sir, that I may tell you once for all. The falsifications of Authours perverted by this your Disswader, are so many, so notorious and gross ones, that in the very relating them I shall tire both my self and you. My design is only to let you know, that this whole work of his *Disswasive from Popery*, if the proofs and citations he brings for his talk were true, as they are all false, signifies nothing at all. Two worthy Catholik Gentlemen have discovered by the help of the Libraries in London and Oxford so many most gross falsifications, one of them a hundred and fifty, the other yet more and greater, that it cannot but amaze an honest minded reader to behold them. Pray read them Sir, and ponder seriously; and so rid of that trouble, I shall make the more haste in my own design. It was their endeavour it seems to show him to be dishonest, mine is only to prove him impertinent. God reward them for their pains, and help me in mine. For my hand denies me now his office, not able to write with that facility it was wont. But becaus I saw no abler pen to appear, as I thought they would in the confutation of this slanderous book: I judged it my part, Sir, to give you som general hints of light concerning it, till there might issue som more plenary

nary confutation by a better hand. And here, Sir, you must know too, that I had no sooner finished this my Epistle, but that I understood of another book against this Doctor Taylors *Disswasive*, a very solid book written by Ja. Ser. in order to his own book called *Sure-Footing* lately set forth, which made me doubt for a while, whether I should let this of mine appear; especially when I considered the industry, care, and solidity of those three men; the last whereof had so taken up what the other two had left for me to say, and so utterly confounded this *Disswasive*, that I might well be silent. But I remembred a story which I had sometime read in holy writ, of Joas the King of Israel; who coming to visit Elizeus the Prophet when he lay sick on his death-bed, was bid by him for his encouragement against his enemies, to *strike the ground with the javelin he had in his hand*. Joas at his word struck the floor three times. But the holy man of God was angry with him and said; *If thou hadst struck five or six or seven times, thou hadst smote Syria even to an utter consummation; but now thou shalt smite it but thrice*. So very faulty is this *Disswasive*, that it cannot be smote too often, even to an utter consummation.

• §. 2 *Which is about a leash of new Articles.*

“ Sayes, that in the Church of Rome faith  
 “ and Christianity encreas like the moon: and  
 “ that ther be now two new articles of faith a  
 coin-

“coining, namely the immaculate Conception,  
 “and the Popes being above the Council: and  
 “one other lately produced in the Council of  
 “Trent, sess. 21. which is, *That although the*  
 “*antient Fathers did give the Communion to In-*  
 “*fants, yet they did not beleev it necessary to sal-*  
 “*vation*: Which decree is, saith he, beyond all  
 “bounds of modesty and evident truth.

Here your Doctour tells news of one Article lately made, and two more a coining, which will shortly be out of the mint: both which news he knows, but we know not. Indeed Sir, this section belongs more to a writer of Diurnals or weakly Intelligencer, than to a Doctour of Divinity. And therfor at the reading of it, I turned suddenly to the frontispiece of the book, to see whose *Imprimatur* it had to it. And I found it licensed, not by Mr. P<sup>r</sup> Estrange, but Geo. Stradling. First then he tells us news to come, and then news past.

A pair of faith articles are now, he saith, in the mint, and will shortly come forth, *The Virgins immaculate Conception, and the Popes being above a Council*. But how can your Disswader say, that these two are shortly to com forth, wheras in this very section he tells us a little afterward, that the Council of Basil decreed the second Article against the Pope. And I am sure, the same Council of Basil decreed the first article of the immaculate Conception,  
 sess.

sess. 36. Surely the year of our Lord 1431, when that Councel was kept, is not now to come. Where and when, and how can they be more then they are already? I suppose he prophesies this by reason of som vehement disputes about those points. If this be it, he may adde yet five hundred more, which are more vehemently disputed than these be. One of them it is much he could miss. For the superiority betwixt the King of France and Spain has been often agitated not only by their Embassadours in Kingdoms where they reside, but even in Councels also, and that with too much of vehemency there.

As concerning the Conception, I know the two schools of divine S. Thomas and subtile Scotus have much altercation about an instant of time, an Aristotelical Instant, so swift and short an instant, that no thought of man, though never so nimble, can ever catch it. And the general Pastour has silenced that School-dispute, becaus it sounded ill, and signified nothing. What is it to action, or any esteem towards that Blessed Virgin, that she was pure in her Conception by Gods preventing grace, as one school speaks, or by his sanctifying grace, as the other school declares it; that she was ever Immaculate, Gods mercy providing that in no instant imaginable she should be liable to original sin, as Scotus teaches; or Gods grace  
so

so working, that immediatly after that instant she should be made pure and holy, as Saint Thomas speaks. For this is the school dispute, which your Disswader, if he understands himself, here talks of. And those very Doctours who dispute this, and all pious Christians have ever unanimously beleev'd, that the Blessed Virgin was not only most pure and unspotted in her whole life, but even from her first animation in the womb. So that if we speak of a real and complete Conception, she is already beleev'd to be Immaculate. And from this universal Tradition, wherein Catholiks agree, and are already resolved, the first reforming Protestants departed, as well as from many others. Nor in any probability will ever that Aristotelical School instant, which signifies just nothing, as to any Christian action, be ever thought of: unless som greater disorder then I have yet heard of, exact a further decision about a thing, which it is not the weight of a hair, whether it be expressed according to the school of S. Thomas or of Scotus.

The like I say to that other article, which your Disswader prophesies will shortly come forth, concerning the *Popes being above a Council*. For that ther is, and ought to be, one visible Pastour over all Christs flock upon earth, whether essential or representative, is a Christian Tradition; which Catholiks still embrace,

but Protestants have left. And this tradition, together with the former of the immaculate Conception, if your Disswader had endeavoured to show, either not to have been, or likely not to be perpetual, his endeavour however insufficient, had not been at least impertinent. But instead of that, he tells us, that this and that will shortly com forth new articles, not heeding that himself and such as he have departed from the old.

And this his prophecie in this, is as vain as in the other. For that the Pope, who is and ever was beleev'd the head and Prince of the whole Council, should be also above it, and his authority there greater then all the rest beside, is a speculative querk, that ambition may think, but sober reason will never deem of moment. For whether he be above the Council, that is to say, of greater authority then all the other Prelates put together; or not above, but their authority joyned together as great, or greater then his: neither they without him, nor he without them, can positively declare any thing with authentick authority, for the silencing of differences which arise in faith. I'th interim the chief Prelate is for certain above the Council in this sence: that he is their Prince and Superiour: as also he has in himself a negative voice, both with the Council, and without it. For this is a right ingrafted naturally in the  
con-



condition of all whatever superiority, spiritual or civil: without which they could not rule or mannage their charge. By it they silence discquiets, and end debates, according to the tenour of laws already made, which in such cases, they are by their place and office to interpret; so far at least, that one party shall not carry it against the other, which he shall judge in such and such circumstances to com nearer to law and right, than he. This power I say every superiour must have over his subjects, whether his authority be greater then all theirs put together in the making of laws, or not. Nor is it of any concernment at all, since one without the other can enact no laws, that may have their full and perpetual force, which of them is the greater. The statutes and acts that are made in any Kingdom by the King and Parliament of the place, have the same force, whether the Kings Majesty, who is superiour prince, and head of the Parliament, be above the whole Parliament, that is, of more authority than all the rest there put together, and weighed in a ballance against him, yea or no. Nor would he gain or lose any one jot of his dignity, authority, or reverence, whatever should be concluded in a pair of subtil speculatours scales, concerning that point. Although for my part, I hold it little better than busie sedition, to rais such fantastick doubts. And the danger of it we experienced

here in this Kingdom but the other day. And I may be bold to say, by what I know and heard my self, that the hint was given them by Ministers talking upon this point of the Popes not being above his Council. Catholiks know how to obey their Pope and Pastour, whether he be above or not above a Council, which silly querk concerns not them to think of. But others are apt to catch fire at any thing, which may any wayes dissolve the bands of their due obedience. Thus much concerning the two points of school-speculation, which your Disswader prophesies will shortly be determined. But he does but dream, and so let him sleep on.

The third new article, is that which was lately produced, saith he, in the Council of Trent, sess. 21. which is, *That although the ancient Fathers did give the Communion to Infants, yet they did not beleeve it necessary to salvation.*

Your Disswader seems here tacitly to grant, that all the other Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent are old and primitive doctrine. He would not otherwis have culled out from thence this one only article for new.

I looked into the Council of Trent, and found there no such article of faith as this your Disswader speaks. The Canon or Article of faith concerning this point runs thus. *Si quis dixerit parvulis, antequam ad annos discretionis pervenerint, necessariam esse Eucharistiae commun-*  
*onem,*

*onem, anathema sit.* And this is all the articles of faith determined in that Council upon this affair: wherein the faithful are forbid to hold that the Communion of Infants is necessary to salvation. If any one, sayes the Council, shall say, that communion of the Eucharist is necessary to babes before they come to years of discretion, let him be Anathema. And this doctrine I am perswaded your Disswader himself holds for good. But this would not make him sport enough. And therfor he lets pass the Canon or Article of faith, and speaks of the doctrine or Declaration of it, which is not propounded for faith at all to any beleever, although all Catholiks that know it, adhere to it as good and solid. And this is his first legerdemain, to propound that for an Article of faith, which is only a doctrine or declaration of faith. His next trick is, to make it run short like a Canon of faith, whereas it is a large and serious explication, wherein those words he catches at are so connexed with others, that their rationality there appears, which here is hid. Third is, that he makes it the Councils business to determin only a matter of fact of the ancient Fathers not beleieving infants communion necessary, though themselves used it: which was none of the Councils intention; but insinuated only by way of anticipation to cut off the arguments of hereticks, who strengthened their error about the neces-

cessity of infants communion, by example of the ancient Fathers who practised it. *Denique eadem sancta Synodus docet parvulos usu rationis carentes nulla obligari necessitate ad Sacramentalem Eucharistiae Communionem: Siquidem per Baptismi lavacrum regenerati, & Christo incorporati, adeptam jam filiorum Dei gratiam in illa etate amittere non possunt. Neque ideo tamen damnanda est antiquitas, si eum morem in quibusdam locis aliquando servavit. Ut enim sanctissimi illi Patres sui facti probabilem causam pro illius temporis ratione habuerunt, ita certe eos nulla salutis necessitate id fecisse sine controversia credendum est.* Thus speaks the Council in their doctrine or declaration of that Article of faith. *Siquis dixerit.* But enough of this business. And although your Disswaders talk deserv it not, yet your own satisfaction concerning these three novelties here specified, because I thought it might haply require what I have said thereof, pray take it in good part. And be assured that faith and Christianity in the Roman Church increases not like the moon; although out of that Church it decreases indeed like the moon in her wain, daily and in all Reformations to the worse.

§. 3. *Which is about Indulgences.*

“ Sayes that the doctrine of Indulgences is  
 “ wholly new and unknown to antiquity, as An-  
 “ tonius, Prierias, Byshop Fisher, Agrippa, and  
 “ Duran-

"Durandus, Popish doctours do acknowledg.  
 "And hence it is, that Gratian and Magister  
 "sententiarum, both of them eminent doctours  
 "among the Papists, have not a word of them.  
 "Indeed in primitive times, when the Byshop  
 "imposed severall penances, and that they  
 "were almost quite performed, and a great  
 "cause of pitty intervned or danger of death,  
 "or an excellent repentance, or that the mar-  
 "tyrs interceded, the Byshop did sometimes in-  
 "dulge to the penitent, and relax som remain-  
 "ing parts of his penance. But the Roman  
 "doctrin of Indulgence is another thing. They  
 "talk of Jubilees and treasure of the Church,  
 "and pilgrimages, which ancient Fathers ei-  
 "ther speak against, or never heard of. In fine,  
 "theirs is becom a doctrin of solution not ab-  
 "solution, that is, the sinner is to go free with-  
 "out any punishment: which is destructive to  
 "true repentance, and right hope, to Christs  
 "merits, and free pardon, nourishes pride and  
 "brings in money, condemned by holy Scri-  
 "ptures and ancient Fathers, who teach repen-  
 "tance reducing to a good life, faith in Christs  
 "merits, and hope in his promises. Neither  
 "can any Papists tell what they are the better  
 "for their Indulgences; or whether they be  
 "absolutions or compensations; whether they  
 "take off actual penances, or potential; such  
 "as be due in the court of man, or of God;

“ whether they avail, if the receiver do nothing  
 “ for them, or not ; whether they depend only  
 “ of Christs satisfaction, or the Saints like-  
 “ wis. And therfor the Councel of Trent durst  
 “ determin nothing about all these things, but  
 “ contented themselves only to declare this,  
 “ *That ther is in the Church a power of granting*  
 “ *Indulgences* ; advising Catholiks to set other  
 “ superfluous and curious questions aside.

Sir, if I had had the opportunity to print the  
 four paragraffs, which to lessen the book I left  
 out of my *Fiat Lux*, becaus one of them was  
 about *Indulgence*, I should need to say the less to  
 this section ; wherein I must notwithstanding be  
 brief, that I may speak somewhat also to those  
 that follow.

Three things are in this his third section con-  
 fusedly jumbled together by your Disswader  
 concerning this busines of *Indulgence* ; Faith,  
 School-philosophy, and Abuses. Catholik faith  
 and Tradition he sets down himself p. 17. and  
 acknowledges it for good. Now lest the Roman  
 Emiffaries, saith he, should deceiv any of the good  
 sons of the Church, we think it fit to acquaint them  
 that in the primitive Church when the Byskop im-  
 posed severe pennances, and that they were almost  
 quite performed, and a great caus of pittie inter-  
 vened or danger of death, or an excellent repen-  
 tance, or that the Martyrs interceded, the Byskop  
 did sometimes indulge to the Penitent, and relax  
 som

some of the parts of his penance; and according to the example of S. Paul in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, gave them ease, lest they should be swallowed up with too much sorrow. These are his words. And in them he hath set down exactly, not only the faith, but all the faith of Roman Catholiks in this point, to stop the mouths of Roman Emissaries: which faith and practise he acknowledges also expressly to be antient and primitive. And thus much he would have us beleeve that Protestants hold and allow; although not their books and writings only which manifestly gainsay it, but their very practise, which hath long ago abandoned, and is now utterly ignorant either of confession or penance, or relaxation or indulgence; and the very Articles of the English Protestant Church refute him. But he that writes against Popery, need not heed what he says. If another say the contrary, so that he speak against Popery too, they will both pass for good.

But the Papists, saith your Disswader, *they are quite gone from this primitive way: their doctrine of Indulgence is another thing, quite another thing.* And then jumbles together heaps of their school-disputes, about solutions, absolutions, compensations, relaxations, and such like stuff; which together with some abuses that time has brought forth, as well in that as other affairs, and which Councils and Pastours have in all  
ages



ages endeavoured to rectifie, must make up a Miscellan, which he would have to be thought the Popery of this busines. Good Lord! Is this ignorance in your dissuading Doctour, or *illud quod dicere nolo*. He acknowledges manifestly, that the Council of Trent decided no more than that very Tradition, which the Church hath kept in all ages, acknowledged here by the Disswader himself to be primitive. Nor can he bring any Catholik Council that hath decided any more, or any Gospel or Tradition for more. If school-divines questions, that are raised beyond faith in this point as well as hundreds of others, may suffice to infer that Roman Catholiks are departed from the ancient primitive way, although they keep it, he may as well say they are departed from the old faith of the Trinity, Creation, Incarnation, Sacraments, Resurrection, Justice, Grace, and the whole contents of the old and new Testament. For though they keep the ancient faith concerning all these things, yet have their schoolmen raised many hundreds, nay thousands of questions and conclusions beyond that faith, that be variously agitated in the schools amongst them. Your Disswaders craft lies in this, that whilst he brings in here these school-disputes for popish faith and popery; and points out eminent Doctours amongst Papists, who witness these fancies to be new and unknown to antiquity, as  
Anto-

Antonius, Prierias, Fisher, Durandus, Maior-  
 nis, Cajetan; and the Council of Trent, either  
 not able, or not willing to determin them: he  
 hopes his reader will easily beleev, without  
 much labour of his, that Popery is not only a  
 new foppery, but a confusion inextricable. This  
 is his drift not only in this section, but all his  
 whole book. But he is intangled in his own  
 snare. For if neither the Council of Trent  
 determined those things, nor yet any other  
 Council in the Catholik world, nor any ancient  
 Tradition delivered, nor her Doctours acknow-  
 ledg them, then is ther not any popery therin:  
 nor is popery any such thing.

Wherfor your Dissawader is very angry with  
 the Council of Trent, for that they would not  
 there, either justifie the abuses, or determin  
 the school-disputes in that point; but rather  
 condemned the one, and exploded the other. I  
 will set down the Councils decree word for  
 word, that you may see without any further dis-  
 cours of mine, how much your Doctour has  
 abused his reader. It runs thus. *Cum potestas con-*  
*ferendi indulgentias à Christo Ecclesia concessa sit,*  
*atque hujusmodi potestate divinus sibi tradit à an-*  
*tiquissimis etiam temporibus illa usa fuerit; sacro-*  
*sancta Synodus Indulgentiarum usum Christiano*  
*populo maximè salutarem, & sacrorum Concili-*  
*orum autoritate probatum, in Ecclesia retinendum*  
*esse docet & præcipit, eosq; anathemate damnat,*  
 qui

qui aut inutiles esse assertunt, vel eas concedendi in Ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem & probatam in Ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit, ne nimia facilitate Ecclesia disciplina enervetur. Abusus verò qui in his irrepserunt, & quorum occasione insigne hoc Indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos & correctos cupiens, præsentì decreto generaliter statuit pravos questus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Ceteros vero qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodocunque provenerunt, cùm ob multiplices locorum, & provinciarum apud quas hi committuntur corruptelas, commodè nequeant specialiter prohiberi, mandat omnibus Episcopis, ut diligenter quisq; hujusmodi abusus Ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosq; in prima Synodo Provinciali referat, &c. Thus the holy Council condemns, and labours with all fatherly and pastourly care possible, to prevent and amend the abuses, which your Disswader here sets down as one part of Popery in this point; and the school-philosophy, which he makes the other part therof, the self same Council explodes in their decree of Purgatory, which your Disswader calls the mother of Indulgences. *Præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis, saith the Council, ut sanam doctrinam à sanctis Patribus & sacris Conciliis traditam à Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, & ubiq; prædicari*

*dicari diligenter studeant. Apud rudem verò plebem difficiliore ac subtiliores quaestiones, quae ad adificationem non faciunt. & ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, à popularibus concionibus secludantur. Incerta item & quae specie falsi laborant, evulgari, ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero quae ad curiositatem quandam aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiant, tanquam scandala & fidelium offendicula prohibeant.* I would we could see our English Bishops meet together in a Councel, and make such pious and fatherly provisions against scandalous books, seditious sermons, and vicious customs, as this Popish Councel has don. They would then give som help to temporal authority, and not lay all the burthen upon their shoulders, whilst themselves sit like drones in their fat benefices, and do nothing. But here you may see Sir, that all that which your Disswader makes here to be Popery; abusive customs, and school-philosophy, is by a general Popish Councel expressly excluded from it. What strange kinde of audacity is this, to call that Popery or Catholik faith, which Catholik Doctors deny, Catholik Councils exclude, and Catholik Professours never think of. But what your Disswader knows to be new, he first puts that upon Papists for their faith; and then tells them that their faith is new.

And your Disswader, as I told you before, is  
much

much troubled, and murmurs bitterly against the Council of Trent: for that they would not determin those philosophical subtilties, whether Indulgences be solutions or absolutions, whether donations or compensations, whether for potential or actual pennances, whether in the Court of God or man, whether out of the treasure of Christ or Saints, whether upon condition of doing something or nothing. *The Council*, quoth he, *slubbereth all the whole matter both in the question of Indulgences and Purgatory, in general and recommendatory terms; affirming that the power of giving Indulgence is in the Church, and that the use is wholesom; and that all hard and subtile questions concerning Purgatory, (which although if it be at all, it is a fire, yet is it the fuel of Indulgences, and maintain them wholly) and all that is suspected to be false, and all that is uncertain, and whatsoever is curious and superstitious, scandalous, or for filthy lucre, be laid aside. And in the mean time they tell us not what is and what is not superstitious, nor what is scandalous, nor what they mean by the general term of Indulgence. And they establish no doctrine, neither curious nor incurious. Nor durst they decree the very foundation of this whole matter the Churches treasure, neither durst they meddle with it, but left it as they found it, and continued in the abuses; and proceed in the practice, and set their Doctors as well as they can to defend all the new curious and*  
scan-

*scandalous questions, and to uphold the gainfull trade.* Thus heavily poor man does your Diswader complain of the Councels silence in those philosophical points, neither resolving the doubts, nor so much as explicating the terms therof, that he might understand, what is superstitious, and what is scandalous, and what they mean by Indulgence, and what by curious, and the like hard words. Ith' interim while the Councel sends him to school to learn the meaning of those hard words, and the result of those disputes, which belonging not to faith, make little to edification, and from whence no accession to piety can be made, nor indeed any useful knowledg, all your Disswaders sport is spoiled. And he has som reason indeed to complain and weep. But I pray you Sir consider; If I have a releasement granted me from som temporal penalties due to my misdoings, what does it concern me to know, whether that releasement be a substance or an accident, whether it be in the predicament of quantity or quality, whether it be a solution or absolution, whether it be from power or bounty, whether it issue as out of a treasure, or from a tribunal, or the like. The Schoolmen whence your Doctour picked those curious questions, would I am sure have acquainted him with their opinions concerning all such things, if he had staid to read their answers. But he was in haste; and indeed it concerned

cerned him not to know their resolution: He had enough, to pick out their philosophicall prattle in the general heads of it, which because it is found in the school-books of such as are Catholik beleivers, he makes no doubt, but the very naming of it will suffice to perswade the Land, that it is all popish doctrine and Popery; and that Papists cannot agree in it; and that it is new. Indeed Sir, he has great need to go to school to those Doctours, not only to hear their resolutions, but to understand the very terms of the question. For had he known, what those very words of *solution* and *absolution* mean, he had never added that absurd interpretation of his own, which he gives p. 20. *It is a very strange thing*, saith he, *a solution not an absolution, that is the sinner is let go free without punishment in this world, or world to come*: a wise interpretation of a pittiful Divine.

But I cannot stand here to give notice of his special mistakes, simple inferences, vain insultings, and particular falsifications, all which are gross and various. I do only assure you Sir, that if he mean by Popery the Religion and faith of Roman Catholiks concerning this business of Indulgences, in one period above named, he approves, establishes, and ratifies it all. And in all the rest he sayes nothing against it, and indeed nothing at all to it. For the subtille curious theories that are made by wits upon this  
sub-



subject, over and above what their faith extends unto, as well as in all other things even from the worlds first creation to its final consummation, all whatever is contained in the whole Bible, about which they have raised many thousands of disputes, over and above that which is there plainly delivered by their faith, these for such as are at leisure and love them, may serve for Academick exercise and discours. The disorders and abuses that have been in this, as well as other affairs, all good men and sacred Councils have laboured to their power to suppress and rectifie. And are ther not abuses of all kinds in the Protestant world, notwithstanding any endeavors to the contrary? But the faith that is in this point and all the whole practice of it, Catholiks still hold, and Protestants have forsaken it: For these have neither confession of sins, nor pennance for those sins confest, nor indulgence of any such pennances enjoyned, as Catholiks have. Indeed the Prelat Protestant keeps still one ancient custom of *commuting*, as they call it, which is but a new word for *Indulgence*, when the pennance of standing in a white sheet for one kind of sin imposed, is upon som considerations released. For although the Reformation have taught, that Matrimony is no Sacrament, but a meer secular contract, yet Ministers I know not how keep still that Spiritual Court (as they call it) unto themselves; as

R

being

being it seems the only men that are able to judge in those affairs. But there be other sins that require penance and satisfaction, besides that one: and other penance besides a white sheet to be commuted.

§. 4. *Which is about Purgatory.*

“ Sayes that Purgatory is another ill novelty: both because the Greek Fathers never  
 “ make any mention of Purgatory, and also because the doctrines on which it is built are either false or at least dubious; as that there is  
 “ distinction betwixt mortal sins and venial; that sin may be taken away, the obligation  
 “ to punishment remaining; that God requires of us a full exchange of penances for the  
 “ pleasure of sin, notwithstanding Christ suffering for us. But Papists are deceived in this  
 “ point upon two mistakes; the first whereof is, that ancient Fathers used to pray for the  
 “ dead: but they prayed not in relation to Purgatory: and so the Church of England allows to pray for the departed, namely as the  
 “ Fathers did. The second is, that the Fathers speak of a fire of purgation after this life,  
 “ which was but an opinion of such a thing after the day of judgment. And this is also refuted by those other Fathers, who hold the  
 “ souls to be kept in secret receptacles untill dooms-day, which opinion cannot stand with  
 “ Purgatory. Beside St. Austin in his time,  
 “ doubt.

“doubted whether Purgatory was, or no. And  
 “though ancient Fathers speak much of inter-  
 “medial states and purgations, and fires, and  
 “common receptacles and delivery of souls,  
 “yet they never agreed throughout with the  
 “Church of Rome. But Papists have been  
 “brought into this beleef by frightful relati-  
 “ons of apparitions, which the wiser sort be-  
 “leeve not. And Tertullian denies that the  
 “souls of the dead do ever appear. How the  
 “Greek Church denies this purgatory doctrine,  
 “appears in the Council of Florence. More-  
 “over S. Cyprian and others teach against it,  
 “that after death is no place for penance; no  
 “purgation: and no less holy scripture, who  
 “saith, Blessed are those who dye in the  
 “Lord.

What a rapsody of stuff is here? *Papists gathered this doctrine of Purgatory out of false grounds: Papists have been frightened into this doctrine of Purgatory by apparitions. The Fathers speak of a fire of purgation after this life, but they meant not as Papists do. The Fathers held secret receptacles for souls until dooms-day; but that cannot stand with Papists Purgatory: though they speak much of intermedial states, yet that does not agree throughout with the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. And blessed are the dead; for they rest from their labours. Blessed surely had your Disswader been, if he had rested from his labours too.*

Sir, if your Disswader had meant to say any thing to the purpos in this affair, he should have clearly set down in this his section; before he had discoursed further, what is the Papists beleef and practice in this business. But this he utterly omits and neglects to do, lest he should spoil his own sport; and thinks it enough, in a rambling talk to say, that *the Fathers prayed for the dead, the Fathers spoke much of intermedial states, but no Greek Fathers, no Latin Fathers agree with the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, S. Cyprian denied it, S. Austin doubted it, the Scripture is against it, the grounds for it are dubious, apparitions for it are frivolous.* And he never speaks one word what that Roman doctrine of Purgatory is: nor can I imagin what he fancies it to be. If he do but speak against it, be it what it will, he has said enough. So he thinks. But Sir, had he declared it as he ought to have don, it had then clearly appeared, that those Fathers who prayed for a joyfull Resurrection to their friends departed, who speak of a fire of purgation after this life, of an intermedial state and purgations and delivery of souls thence, were directly and perfectly of the now present Papists beleef: and that St. Austins doubting, whatever it was, and the Greeks disagreeing in Florence, and S. Cyprians affirming that there is no place of repentance after this life, so far as they are truly cited, stand all very well, perfect, and

and completely with the Roman Catholik belief and practice.

But what think you, Sir, of our English Protestant Church? Does she pray, or so much as leave it indifferent to pray for the dead, as this Disswader speaks, if it be not don in relation to Purgatory? the name Purgatory I mean. For if they pray for the refreshment, ease, and comfort of souls departed as ancient holy Fathers did, ther is nothing els but the bare name remaining, if those prayers bear any sence. Hath the Protestant Church any altar, or priesthood, or sacrifice for the dead, which all ancient Fathers both Greek and Latin speak of, as the usage and custom of the Christian Church in their times? Does any amongst them, when he dies, give alms either to priests or poor people, or other friends to pray for his soul when he is departed hence? Is not he looked upon, that shall be heard to say for his deceased friend, *God give him rest, or God grant him a joyful Resurrection*, as either som profest, or at least a tacit and concealed Papist? What is it this Doctor then tells us, of the English Churches allowing prayer for the dead, which our very Protestant articles condemn, and all their writers have hitherto opposed. Nor have they any Priests amongst them to perform any such rite in that way the Fathers speak of, and used themselves on their altars, which are all razed

here to the ground. And as for the people, they neither do, nor dare, under the danger of being thought Papists, if they had the mind, either practise or commend any such custom.

*But Greek Fathers never mention Purgatory, as Polydor and Roffensis witness.* Where does Polydor and Roffensis witness that? How would your Disswader have them mention it? *Purgatorium* is a latin word, and not to be found in greek writings. Did not S. Basil pray to God, for rest and pardon for the soul of thy servant N. N. Does not S. Chrysostom speak of his offering sacrifice for all those who slept before us, &c. and for the rest and pardon of thy servant N &c. Does not S. Cyril frequently say, *We offer this sacrifice for our deceased Fathers and Bishops, and all those who have departed this life, &c.* And S. Epiphanius, *We make mention both of just and sinners, &c.* And what is the Papists Purgatory for Gods sake, but only such a condition of souls deceased, as requires help from the prayers of the faithful living. This I take to be the Roman doctrine, or Catholik beleef, both of the Eastern and Western part of the Church, both Greeks and Latines, wherein all ancient Christians unanimously agreed. And your Disswader, that he may leave it free for every mans thoughts to imagin what he lists, never speaks himself what it should be.

*But the Fathers prayed for those who perhaps never*

never were in Purgatory, as Apostles, &c. And they prayed too for those who perhaps were there, or in that condition that required their prayers. Truth is, they prayed far differently for the just ones and other men: as any one may see in those very Fathers, insinuated in those your Disswaders words. And if some just ones commemorated by the Fathers wanted not our prayers, does this infer that no condition of souls deceased wants them, or that those Fathers who prayed also for others then deceased, as wanting those helps, although in another manner than for the just, should think so? I trow not, however your Doctour throws his ink about confusedly to blind our eyes.

But S. Austin doubted whether there were any Purgatory or no. And is it likely Sir, that he who in his *Enchiridion. Cura pro mortuis. Civitate Dei*, and several other of his works speaks so expressly of souls expiation after death, and of the sacrifices which himself made being a Priest for souls deceased, in particular for his mother Monica, and her husband, for that end so expressly I say and clearly, that no Roman Catholik now, either does or could possibly say more, should doubt whether there were after this life any expiatory place or condition?

I will but set down two or three places of many in that holy Fathers works, which may suffice to show his mind. *Temporarias penas alii*



*in hac vita tantum, alii post mortem, alii & nunc & tunc patiuntur, l. 21. de Civitate Dei. Again, Orationibus vero sanctæ Ecclesiæ & sacrificio salu-  
tari, & eleemosynis quæ eorum spiritibus erogantur, non est dubitandum mortuos adjuvati, ut cum eis misericordius agatur à Domino, quam eorum pec-  
cata meruerunt: hoc enim à patribus traditum universa observat Ecclesiæ. De verb. apost. serm.*

*34. Again, Neq̃ negandum est defunctorum ani-  
mas pietate suorum viventium relevari, cum pro  
illis sacrificium mediatoris offertur, Ench. c. 10.*

The Disswader cannot but have read several such like passages in that eminent Doctor. And the jest is, that the place he cites for S. Austins doubting of Purgatory, is one of those wherein he expressly teaches it. So expert a Doctour is this of yours. What is it then St. Austin doubted? For he must needs doubt something. Otherwise ther had been nothing for your Disswader to catch hold of. Speaking therfor of those sufferings after this life, before eternal bliss can be obtained, in which condition such as upon a good foundation have built som light matter, which the Apostle calls wood, hay, and straw, may be saved; yet so as by fire, S. Austin doubts whether those very affections men bear to things in this life, which are lawfully had, but lost with som grief, may not burn, and afflict them in that place of expiation, as well as other venial offences, and be som part of the wood,  
hay,

hay, and straw the Apostle mentions. And truly the doubt is very rational, and remains still a doubt. But when your Disswader takes here-upon occasion to say, that St. Austin doubted Purgatory, I cannot doubt but that he wanted either sincerity in his heart, or eyes in his head.

*But in the time of Otho, in the twelfth age of the Church, the doctrine of Purgatory was got no further than a Quidam asserunt, Some say so. Sir,* Otho here cited to say *quidam asserunt*, speaks not at all of any expiation after death, as your Disswader would have us think, but after judgment, which some divines in those dayes held over and above that which their faith had delivered: which opinion had then but a *some say so* for it, as it hath also now: and it was then, and is now but a philosophical opinion. Can you beleev your Disswader did not see this? It was truly, if he did see it, a gross and inexcusable insincerity, to make Otho say it was only the opinion of some, that ther was a purgation after death, who expressly treats of that particular opinion concerning a purgation after judgment, which their faith and religion did not reach unto. But as I told you before, I must not insist upon your Disswaders falsifications, however they be various and very gross, because that work is well don already, and my design looks another way. As he is to blame, for  
making

making ſom Fathers think and ſpeak what they did not ; ſo is he, while he makes all the Fathers in general to acknowledg and praſtiſe as much in this point, as any Roman Catholik beleevs, and yet addes withall, that thoſe Fathers notwithstanding agreed not with the Roman doctrine, which himſelf never declares what it is, moſt palpably ridiculous.

But the doctrine of Purgatory is grounded, ſaith your Diſſwader, upon false principles, as upon a ſuppoſed diſtinction betwixt venial ſins and mortal, between ſin and its obligation to puniſhment, &c. Sir, if we would ſpeak properly, neither is this beleef of future expiations, nor any other point of Catholik Religion to be called a doctrine, or opinion, or judgment, of ſom divines or all divines, or any ſuch like thing. For it is the faith as well of divines, as other Chriſtians ; unto which they as well as theſe ſubmit all equally with the ſame reſignation, and no doctrine of any mans. Upon the pin of this one miſtake, if it be a miſtake, and not rather a malicious wilfulneſs, hangs all this your Doctors Diſſwaſive, which being removed, all his whole book falls to the ground. And therfor it were worth the labour to diſcours more copiouſly upon this ſubject ; which all Anticatholiks either underſtand not, or diſſemble, that they may have the more ample field of ſcholactical Divines, and ſom rotten Caſuiſts to ride a hunt-  
ing

ing in, when they chase Popery; which the world must beleev to be a doctrin of divines. And this doctrin must not be the doctrin of any one of their schools, much less of all their schools, but of this or that obscure man, who followed no school at all: nor any good thing that he delivered, but som uncouth odd speech unheedfully dropt from his pen: nor this candidly delivered neither, as he spoke it, but wrested and perverted against his meaning. And this is the mode of chasing that wild beast of Popery, with seven heads and ten horns, made by the slight of ministers both terrible, and yet at the self-same time ridiculous to people: not to all: for God be thanked there be very many grave and wise men in the land, but only to the inferior and more numerous sort of people, such as will stand to hear Jack Pudding talk in Bartholomew Fair. But I have not now time to enlarge my self upon this subject, as it may deserv. I say then that no Catholik faith, which ministers express by the odious name of Popery, is properly speaking, any mans doctrin; much less is it a doctrin grounded upon this or that principle, as indeed all school-doctrin is; but it is a Catholik faith and beleef, grounded immediately upon the veracity. and truth of the Revealer our Lord and his Apostles. But your Disswader speaks still of doctrin, and Roman doctrin, and grounds of doctrin, as if he were  
utter-

utterly unacquainted with faith, Christian faith, and of all he is to speak; imagining Religion to be som school conclusion of Philosophers; wherein he is either notoriously mistaken, or would in his heart have others most notoriously to mistake. Wherfor, although I could easily defend those scholastical grounds, wheron he sayes the doctrin of Purgatory is built; yet I must first tell him that which is of more concern both for himself and others to know; namely that those are not, be they true or fals, any grounds of Purgatory at all: nor is Purgatory a doctrin built upon those grounds. What then are those assertions, that *som sins are mortal, som not, that the pardon of sin may stand with an obligation to temporal punishment, &c.* They are, Sir, rational congruities invented by Catholik Divines, the more fully to clear unto weak beleevvers the rationality and truth of that old Christian Tradition concerning our expiatory sufferings after this life, before entrance into glory. But if we will look for more ancient and Christian-like grounds for this expiation, so far as one busines of faith may be said to be grounded on another, (even as Gods attributes are said by school-divines one to flow from the other, namely in order to our understanding, which cannot otherwise think or speak of that most simple and infinic being) the great *depositum fidei* affords other grounds, far bet-

better, more intelligible, simple and easie grounds of Purgatory, than those your Disswader catches at, although even they be solid and good ones too: As for example these; Christians are culled and called out of darknes by the mercy of their gracious Redeemer unto purity, light and holines, which they are to practice and act all their whole life after: and if they do otherwise, they shall suffer accordingly, so much of pain as they have had of unlawful pleasures, to the despight of that precious blood, that redeemed and brought them out of sin and darknes, and of that holy Spirit of his, wherewith they have been anointed; every one as he hath acted in his body, whether good or evil, being to receive accordingly after this life. So that he who shall at all times, cooperating faithfully with Gods holy grace, keep his hands pure, and heart clean from such enormities, as may violate friendship with his Redeemer, shall be in another condition at his departure, then he who hath in his life time polluted himself and done injury to the sanctifying blood of Christ by his many filthy adulteries, drunkennesses, cheats, flanders, murders, or the like, although by Gods grace, he should find mercy at his last hour. These, if I could stand to enlarge my self upon them, being themselves Christian Traditions and Apostolical doctrine, might in some sense be said to be the grounds of expiatory penalties after

after this life, commonly called Purgatory. But those others which your Disswader mentions, are but som congruities latelier put together by Doctours to clear unto unstable Christians, as far as they may be able, the rationality of their Christian Tradition concerning expiations after this life : which Preachers in their sermons, and Doctours in their chairs usually invent and utter as well in this affair as other busineses of faith, som with more firmitude and som with less, according to their learning and capacity : I say they are congruities for it, and good ones too : but no grounds of it. For faith is not deduced by reasons, or drawn from premises, or concluded from grounds. And although this faith be manifold and about sundry matters, as the Creation, Redemption, Justification, Resurrection, and the like, yet all these particular faiths, depend immediatly like several raies on one sun, upon the one only authority and truth of the first Revealer, which is the foundation and ground of all. And if those above-named assertions be no grounds of this faith concerning future expiations, much less is that true and firm tradition, *Blessed are those that dye in our Lord*, any ground against it. For they are happy, and happy that ever they were born who dye in our Lord : that is to say, in his faith and fear, in his love and grace. But ther are as many degrees of dying in our Lord, as ther be varieties



eties of the lives and actions of those that dye in him. And they all rest from the labours of this life, and som also are freed from the pains of the other, who depart hence in a more complete reconciliation with him.

§. 5. *Which is about Transubstantiation.*

“ Sayes that Transubstantiation is another  
 “ novelty in the Roman Church, so much a no-  
 “ velty, that we know the very time of its  
 “ birth, and how it was introduced. For Sco-  
 “ tus, Occam, Biel, Fisher, Bassolis, Cajetan,  
 “ Melchior Caen acknowledg, that it is not ex-  
 “ prest in Scripture; and in Peter Lombards  
 “ time they knew not whether it was true or no.  
 “ Durandus a good Catholik after the Lateran  
 “ Council where it was first declared, said it  
 “ was not faith, as Scotus sayes it was no faith  
 “ before it: Nor did the Lateran Council de-  
 “ termin that which now the Roman Church  
 “ holds: which doctrin of theirs is a stranger  
 “ to antiquity, as Alphonsus à Castro acknow-  
 “ ledges: and the same is made good by the te-  
 “ stimonies of Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Euse-  
 “ bius, Macarius, Ephrem, Gregory Nazian-  
 “ zen, Chrysostom, Austin, the Canon law it  
 “ self, Theodoret, and Pope Gelasius, who all  
 “ witness that the bread is our Lords body spi-  
 “ ritually. And your Disswader therfor advises  
 “ his charge, to take heed they be not led away  
 “ by rhetorical words, to beleev the Roman  
 “ doctrin

after this life, commonly called Purgatory. But those others which your Disswader mentions, are but som congruities latelier put together by Doctours to clear unto unstable Christians, as far as they may be able, the rationality of their Christian Tradition concerning expiations after this life : which Preachers in their sermons, and Doctours in their chairs usually invent and utter as well in this affair as other busineses of faith, som with more firmitude and som with less, according to their learning and capacity : I say they are congruities for it, and good ones too : but no grounds of it. For faith is not deduced by reasons, or drawn from premises, or concluded from grounds. And although this faith be manifold and about sundry matters, as the Creation, Redemption, Justification, Resurrection, and the like, yet all these particular faiths, depend immediatly like several raies on one sun, upon the one only authority and truth of the first Revealer, which is the foundation and ground of all. And if those above-named assertions be no grounds of this faith concerning future expiations, much less is that true and firm tradition, *Blessed are those that dye in our Lord*, any ground against it. For they are happy, and happy that ever they were born who dye in our Lord : that is to say, in his faith and fear, in his love and grace. But ther are as many degrees of dying in our Lord, as ther be varieties

eties of the lives and actions of those that dye in him. And they all rest from the labours of this life, and som also are freed from the pains of the other, who depart hence in a more complete reconciliation with him.

§. 5. *Which is about Transubstantiation.*

“ Sayes that Transubstantiation is another  
 “ novelty in the Roman Church, so much a no-  
 “ velty, that we know the very time of its  
 “ birth, and how it was introduced. For Sco-  
 “ tus, Occam, Biel, Fisher, Bassolis, Cajetan,  
 “ Melchior Caen acknowledg, that it is not ex-  
 “ prest in Scripture; and in Peter Lombards  
 “ time they knew not whether it was true or no.  
 “ Durandus a good Catholik after the Lateran  
 “ Council where it was first declared, said it  
 “ was not faith, as Scotus sayes it was no faith  
 “ before it: Nor did the Lateran Council de-  
 “ termin that which now the Roman Church  
 “ holds: which doctrin of theirs is a stranger  
 “ to antiquity, as Alphonfus à Castro acknow-  
 “ ledges: and the same is made good by the te-  
 “ stimonies of Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Euse-  
 “ bius, Macarius, Ephrem, Gregory Nazian-  
 “ zen, Chrysostom, Austin, the Canon law it  
 “ self, Theodoret, and Pope Gelasius, who all  
 “ witness that the bread is our Lords body spi-  
 “ ritually. And your Disswader therfor advises  
 “ his charge, to take heed they be not led away  
 “ by rhetorical words, to beleev the Roman  
 “ doctrin

"doctrin, which is an innovation and danger-  
 "ous practice: about which they make many  
 "foolish questions: as whether a mouse may  
 "run away with her maker, whether a Priest is  
 "the Creatour of God, &c. In fine, Transub-  
 "stantiation is absolutely impossible. For  
 "Christs glorious body cannot be broken, nor  
 "yet the mere accidents, nor one body multi-  
 "plied, as be many wafers, and it is against the  
 "demonstration of our senses.

Sir, I know well enough, that Tertullian,  
 Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Macarius, Ephrem,  
 Gregory Nazianzen, Theodoret, Chrysostom,  
 and S. Austin, were all of them not only Ro-  
 man Catholiks, but Catholik priests too, and  
 could easily prove it. But if your Disswader  
 should have the confidence to deny that: I hope  
 yet he will grant me, that Scotus, Occham, Bi-  
 el, Bassolis, Cajetan, Melchior Caen, Durand,  
 and Alphonfus à Castro Papish School-men  
 and Doctours of the Church, and Friars, were  
 all such: and as for Bishop Fisher, Peter Lom-  
 bard, and Pope Gelasius, these I may almost  
 presume he will let pass for Papists. What is  
 then this Roman doctrin, which so many Ro-  
 man Doctours, whereof each one had such a  
 multitude of disciples and followers in the Ca-  
 tholik world, do not so much as acknowledg?  
 Where shall we finde it? For your Disswader  
 names heaps of Popish Doctours, that deny it,

and

and not any one that owns it ; nor ever so much as tells us what it is. What strange kind of proceeding is this ? Nay in the beginning of the section, he tells us that this *Popery of Transubstantiation is so new, that it is well enough known to have begun in the Council of Lateran* : and yet in the middle of the very same section sayes expressly, that the *opinion was not determined in the Lateran Council, as it is now held at Rome*. The Popery or popish doctrine of Transubstantiation now held at Rome, it is very well known to all, saith he, that it had its first beginning in the Lateran Council ; and yet addes, that the opinion was not determined in the Lateran Council, as it is now held at Rome. What opinion, Sir, was determined in the Lateran Council, and what is that which is now held at Rome ? Does not your Diffwader speak of the doctrine now held at Rome, when beginning his section, he speaks thus ? *The doctrine of Transubstantiation is so far from being Primitive and Apostolick, that we know the very time it began to be owned publickly for an opinion, and the very Council in which it passed for a publick doctrine* : which Council two or three lines afterward he sayes was the Council of Lateran under Pope Innocent the third, twelve hundred years after Christ. And against that new doctrine which began, he sayes, twelve hundred years after Christ ; and thereby convicted of novelty, he writes this

his whole section. What means he then in the name of God, but only two pages after, namely p. 39. to say, that the *opinion was not determined in the Lateran as it is now held at Rome*. Is that opinion now held at Rome, younger or older than the Council Lateran; and when began that opinion held at Rome, or was it from the beginning? And against which of the opinions does he speak in this section? For against both of them together he cannot. The very head and principal, and as it were the summe of all his discours in this section, *The doctrine of Transubstantiation is so far from being Primitive and Apostolick, that we know the very time it began, and the Council it passed for a doctrine, &c. It was but a disputable question till the Council of Lateran in the time of Pope Innocent 1200. and more after Christ, &c.* This I say cannot agree with the doctrine now held at Rome, which he sayes afterward is *another thing from that which was determined in the Council of Lateran*. If then this parcel of Popery, which he sayes in one place, is not that which was determined in the Council of Lateran, and in another place is that which was determined in the Council of Lateran, be the matter and subject of his discours in this section, ought he not in plain terms to have told us, what this piece of popery is, that we may know what he speaks of. Surely he ought. If it neither be owned by so many

many popish doctours which here he names, and names not any one popish doctour that owns it: if it neither be determined in the Council of Lateran, nor he himself can name any other Council wherein it was lately or otherwise determined, how is it Popery? What doctours own it? What Council has declared it? What people profes it? And what is that thing they should profes, declare, or own? What is it I say? This he ought to have spoken openly, sincerely, and plainly. And yet he endeavours not at all, which he should one would think have principally heeded, either to set down what doctours own it, or what it is they own: but spends his whole time in telling us only of a great company of popish doctours that like not of that Roman doctrin, which he never declares himself what it is. And then exhorts all his charge and all good people to take heed of that Roman doctrin, that scandalous doctrin, that blasphemous novelty, which was determined in the Council of Lateran, and yet is another thing from that which was determined in the Council of Lateran; not any part of Catholik beleef until that Council, nor yet esteemed to belong to faith after that Council, by the greatest of popish doctours, about which they make many foolish questions, as whether a mouse may run away with her maker, &c.

Sir, your Doctour, who pretending a Dis-



swasive from Popery, by which he doubts not but his reader will understand the Roman Catholik faith, never meant to touch at all their real Religion, which is universally in their hearts and hands, and no power of man is able to confute, but either som obscure parcels of philosophy, or abuses of men, which he is better able to make sport withall, was fallen here it seems upon the Catholik faith, afore he was aware. And therfor he suddenly drew back; and so blundered up and down in the affrightment, that he seems neither to know what to speak, nor against what he is to speak of. *The Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation was first determined in the Lateran Council: The opinion was not determined in the Lateran Council, as it is now held in Rome.* What would this man have? What does he speak of? What opinion is that which is now held in Rome, differing from that of the Lateran Council? What is that doctrine of the Lateran Council, differing from that is now held in Rome? What is that Rome? the Church of Rome or Court of Rome, the City of Rome or schools in Rome? And is it in all Rome or som particular streets, or parishes, or schools, or shops? And how do they hold it? with their hands or teeth, or pens or hearts? as a matter of faith, or busines of dispute, as delivered to them, or invented by them, in their confession of Religion, or profession of Philosophy?

Iosophy? These things ought all of them to have been exprest, that we might rightly understand who in Rome hold it, and how they hold it, and what is that same *It* they hold. But your Disf-wader hopes, that upon those general words of his, *The opinion was not determined in the Lateran Council, as it is now held in Rome*, his unwary reader will be bold to think more, than he dares himself utter. And perhaps he is not deceived. For few readers are wiser than their book.

But *the Romans make many foolish and blasphemous questions about it.* The more blasphemous and foolish they, who urge them to it; if any one amongst them have resolved such doubts, as infidelity in derision of holy things hath raised. They who aforetime denied Gods Incarnation, gave occasion of as foolish and blasphemous disputes as any these be. And if any then studied to give an answer to such fordid, unmanly, and scurrillous opposition, although they might fail in discretion, yet their heart was innocent, and intention good.

The busines which I suppose your Doctour would be at here, is the real presence of our Lords blessed and glorious body under the species of corruptible elements, which is one of the paragrass I left out of my *Fiat*. And I am sorry now with all my heart it was left out: because here is no time or place to treat of it, as

that great and weighty subject would require. Neither is it my intention here to declare the old Christian Tradition: but only to give you, Sir, to understand, that this Disswader, though he may hurt his unwary reader, yet he nothing at all indammages the old Catholik faith, by any words of his, which speak it to be new. Large volumes have been written upon this subject, enough to satisfy any moderate well disposed mind: *qui legit intelligat.*

Let me only give you notice Sir, that this parcel of Christian faith now abolisht here in England, was so antient, that the very old Pagans and Jews derided the primitive Christians above a thousand years ago, for their worshipping a breadden God, as they pleased then, and the infidels of our times are not ashamed now, to misname that sacred mystery: It was so universally beleaved, that their adversaries by that one only mark expressed as it were in short the very substance of their Religion; *Since the Christians adore that which they eat*, said one of the Infidel writers, well enough acquainted with the course of Christian Religion, *let my soul be with Philosophers*: It was to sure and undoubted in their hearts, that som ancient holy Fathers have elucidated the mystery of the Incarnation, by this of the real presence in the Eucharist, as the more manifest: It was so grave and solemn, that all the Churches or Temples in the Christian

stian world, were built principally for it: and the devotion of those times studied to erect them with a strength and magnificence answerable, as far as they could, to the majesty of that divine mystery: It was such a princely leading point of faith, that it drew all other pieties after it, frequent prayers and meditations, alms-deeds, contrition for sins, singing of psalms, hymns and canticles in the Quire before that presence in the Altar, Confessions, Sermons, Catechise, Processions, Fasts, Festivals, and all that real fear and love of God, that has been ever found in Christian hearts: Finally, it is the very legacy of Jesus Christ the holy One, to his Spouse the Church, whereby he proved himself both to be a poor and most loving and also omnipotent Esponse. Another man might leave wealth and possessions; but though he be never so kind and loving, he cannot leave his body to his wife, to remain ever with her for exercise of her love, for comfort of her heart, and glorifying of her soul, by vertue wherof she should be raised up to follow and joyn with him in the eternal glory of another world. This was a Testament only fit for Jesus Prince of Angels and men to make. And this I suppose is that piece of Popery, your Disswader here so fumbles at, that he knows not what to call it, or how to expresse it in his words.

O, but it is Transubstantiation which the Dis-

*swader dislikes.* And what is Transubstantiation? what does it mean? What is that long winded hard word of Transubstantiation, what is the meaning of it? For Catholik Religion, which your Disswader calls Popery, is not words: nor are words Catholik Religion; but the sence, and life, and meaning delivered us by help of words for faith, hope, and charity to feed upon. Neither Consubstantiality, nor Trinity, nor Incarnation, nor Transubstantiation, and such other like phrases, are any thing at all of any Religion. Your Disswader abuses the world, when he tells you, he knows when Transubstantiation first came up. The meaning of it was in the Christian world, all those many ages before that Lateran Council he speaks of: or else it had not been in the world then. Pray let him tell me, whether the *consubstantiality* of the Son of God with his eternal Father who made all things, be a novelty or new article, yea or no. *He knows the very time, as himself here speaks, when it began to be owned publickly for an opinion, and that very Council in which it was said to be passed into a publick doctrine, and by what arts it was promoted, and by what persons it was introduced.* And if he do not know all this, I can tell him. Does this prove that same *Consubstantiation* to be a novelty yea or no? Let him answer me directly. I am a plain man, and love plain dealing. Was Jesus the Son of God  
and

and Saviour of mankind beleevd any other-  
wayes to be true and really God after that Coun-  
cel had declared him to be consubstantial to  
Almighty God his heavenly Father, than he  
was before Christians ever heard of that word  
Consubstantiality or *Consubstantiation*? If  
Christians notwithstanding that new word still  
beleevd and adhered to one and the same old  
faith they did before, then say I the same of  
Transubstantiation. And if that new word  
made no new article, no more does this: Nor  
doth the one word any more belong to Christi-  
an Religion than the other: and both indeed  
only so far, as they conveigh the old faith, by  
this new invented word, guarded against the  
subtillties of the hereticks then living, who by  
their circumventing sophistry deluded all other  
expressions concerning the real presence of the  
Godhead in our Lords humanity, and of his hu-  
manity in the Eucharist, save only that other  
of *Consubstantiation*, and this of *Transubstanti-  
ation*, both words in those dayes equally new.  
And when those heresies and hereticks are  
once vanished, ther is no further use of the  
words amongst Christians, who beleev and wor-  
ship by vertue of their Christian Tradition,  
the very thing it self, Gods divinity in his hu-  
manity, and Christs humanity in his sacred Eu-  
charist, without troubling their heads with  
those hard words, which were invented against  
subtil

subtil hereticks, unless haply the same heresies should rise again. And the Catholik flock acts and beleevs after both those Councils, just as their Christian predecessours did before. They acknowledg Christ our Lord really God, and fear, and love, and hope in him, whether they ever hear of his consubstantiality or consubstantiation with God, or no. Nor do they ever trouble their heads to know, what is the meaning of *con*, or what is *substance*; or what be *accidents*, or what *substantiation*, or *consubstantiation*, no more after that Council of Nice than before it. Such terms and phrases are besides the simplicity of their holy and innocent beleeif, which holds notwithstanding all that is really meant by those words, taught them in a more natural and plainer way. So likewise do Catholik beleevers after the Council of Lateran worship their crucified Redeemer in the Eucharist, in the same manner others did before it, being the very same Christians with those that lived the age before, and think no more of Transubstantiation many thousands of these now, then those others did: that word making no more difference before and after this Council of Lateran, then had *Consubstantiation* made amongst the Catholik Christians, which were before and after that other Council of Nice. By those words som cunning wolves had been by their Pastours discovered and separated from the sheep;



sheep ; and after that the whole flock fed quietly in the same hills, and by the same fountains they did before. And in this sence Catholik Divines might say, and truly say, that Transubstantiation is not of faith either before the Council or after, if any one of them did indeed ever say so. For Christian faith is not words, as I said before, nor words any Religion.

And if those Catholik Divines, who ever they were, meant any thing else ; as namely, that the Christians before that Council of Lateran, who indeed worshipped their Redeemer in the Eucharist as true and fully as any that lived after that Council ever did or can, were not given generally to understand explicitly, that Christ our Lord is so present in the Eucharist, that ther is there no other substance but himself : in this sence they spoke true, that so much had not been spoken expressly by a Council, but yet that the faith and practice of Christians both before and after that Council was the same. And so consequently ther was no more of faith after that Council than was before it ; whether we consider the learned or the common flock of Christians. For these worship Christ in the Eucharist after that Council, as others did before it ; though neither of them think of *Transubstantiation* : and those learned ones spake and wrote of our Lords presence in the Eucharist before that Council,

as others do after it: and both do equally believe the thing that is meant by *Transubstantiation*, which in a diverse sence, according as men speak either of the word or meaning of the word, may be either said to be or not to be of faith, either before the Lateran Council or after it. Those words of Tertullian in his 2. book *ad uxorem*, where he speaks of the marriage of a Gentile with a Christian woman, *Non sciet maritus, quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustet, & si sciverit, panem non illum credat esse qui dicitur, &c.* Those also of S. Cyprian in his *Cœna Domini*. *Panis iste communis in carnem & sanguinem mutatus, &c.* And again; *Panis iste non in specie sed naturâ mutatur, &c.* Those likewise of St. Chrysostom, *de pœnitent serm. 5. Non quod panis sit respicias, neq̃ quod vinum sit reputes, &c.* And again; *Mysteria hic consumi Christi corporis substantiâ, &c.* Those too of S. Greg. Nyssen in his *magna Catechista*. *Rectè ergo nunc quoq̃ Dei verbo sanctificatum panem, εἰς σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομεν:* and again; *Hæc autem dat virtute benedictionis, in illud transelementatâ eorum quæ apparent naturâ.* Lastly, (that I may not forget my own design, which is not here to prove Catholik faith, but only to take a little view of this Disswasive from it) those words of S. Cyril in his *Mystagogica quarta*; *Hoc sciens & pro certissimo habens panem hunc qui videtur à nobis non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse*

*esse sentiat, sed corpus Christi; & vinum quod à nobis conspicitur, tametsi & sensu gustus vinum esse videatur, non tamen vinum, sed sanguinem esse Christi.* . I say these and such like words of ancient Christian Divines, many hundreds of years before the Council of Lateran, speak as much the thing meant by *Transubstantiation*, as any Doctour can expresse it now; though these may know more of the word than they. And indeed the definition of the Catholik Council makes no alteration at all in the practice of Catholik faith, which so considers their Lords presence in the Eucharist, that it never heeds the *Quomodo* or concomitances; the adoration, love, and devotion being still and ever in all things the very same.

If Christ our Lord should appear to two Christians now, as he did once to S. Paul in a splendour of light; and a voice out of that shining brightnes should issue so efficacious, that they should both of them be fully perswaded in their hearts to worship him whom they beleaved both of them there present. I suppose these two would equally do well, and equally do the same thing, although one of them should haply think ther was no other thing there, but his Lord in an appearance of light, and the other should not think at all of the light, whether it were a substance or only an appearance of it. But if a third man should deny the real presence  
of

of our Lord in that light, he would for certain be of another faith. So it is here, Protestants who deny the real presence, are of another beleeif from Catholiks who acknowledg it; but Catholiks who equally adore it, are all of one beleeif, though perhaps not one of a million ever thinks of *Transubstantiation*. O but *Christ might be present in the Eucharist, although Transubstantiation were not*. He might so: and Christ likewise may be owned for God, though *Consubstantiation* were never thought of. Both there and here something is explicately spoken, which was latitant in the former practice and beleeif, and he that can may understand it. But the millions that never heard of it, so long as they beleeiv and worship their Crucified Redeemer, as they ought, in the Eucharist, are never the worse. Had it not been for hereticks, neither Consubstantiation, nor Transubstantiation had been ever heard of: and yet the practice and faith of Catholik Christians the same it is.

The holy Fathers which your Disswader cites against this particle of Catholik beleeif, som say nothing at all there concerning that thing, som speak what he cites in another manner, som teach quite contrary. But this I intend not now to insist upon. Only thus much in general, and I pray you, Sir, mark it well. Those ancient Fathers, who say somtimes, that the words of our Lord are to be understood *spiritually*

*tually not carnally*; and that those symbols are a *figure* of his body, agree with all Catholiks that are now in the world no less in the meaning of those their words, than others wherein they manifestly assert the real presence in this Sacrament. For all Catholiks say, that our Lord is not to be so understood, that his holy body in the Eucharist is to be fed upon in a carnal way, as though it should be divided into gobbets, and so digested by the stomach into flesh and blood, as other meats are: but that as that holy body now glorified is becom a spiritual body, as good S. Paul speaks, totally spiritual and divine, and not now subject to any condition or laws of material corruptible bodies here on earth, so is it spiritually to be taken, as the food not of a mortal body, but the immortal spirit. So likewise do all Catholiks acknowledge and beleev that the symbols after the powerfull blessing of Christs consecration, do so becom his sacred body, by conversion, mutation, or transelementation, as the same Fathers speak; that the outward *appearance* which remains of them is not now any more a *figure* of bread and wine as it was before, but of our Lords precious body and blood which have succeeded in their place. So that those very words of the ancient Fathers, wherein they say, that the elements are now becom a *figure* of Christs body and blood, do prove not only a real presence, but

but a transelementation too, or Transubstantiation, which your Diffwader judges to sound somewhat more. For every material body (I pray you Sir mark this well) I say every material body here on earth, as a tree, a man, or beast, or other thing exhibits to the eye, ear, taste, or other senses an outward *species* of that which it is. And the substance ever goes along in nature with that appearance it exhibits, unless the power of God should interpose, and make it otherwise. Thus when I have bread before me, or milk for example, that I see taken from the cow, I see it, and feel it, and taste it, to be such as it shows it self; and such it is as it shows it self to be. Thus it is in all nature. But we are not, say those good holy Fathers, to think so here. For though here be the colour and touch and taste of bread; yet after this strange and powerful conversion made by Gods omnipotent words, it is no more bread you see, it is not natural bread you touch, it is not material bread you taste, but the blessed body of your Redeemer which is touched, seen, and tasted under those remaining appearances, which are no more now the *figure* of bread, which they were before, but the *figure* of our Lords body under the species, appearance or representation of bread now wonderfully concealed. And thus much is manifestly and clearly exprest by all those holy Fathers. *Hoc sciens*, saith great  
St.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *& pro certissimo habens panem hunc qui videtur à vobis, non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat, sed est Corpus Christi: & vinum quod à nobis conspicitur, tametsi & sensu gustus vinum esse videatur, non tamen vinum, sed sanguinem esse Christi.* And this speak all holy Fathers, both Greek and Latin. It would be endles to bring their testimonies. By these few words, if, Sir, you have heeded them well, you will presently conceiv the meaning of that speech of Tertullian in his third book against Marcion. *Acceptum panem & distributum discipulis Corpus suum illum fecit. Hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset Corpus. Caterum vacua res quod est phantasma figuram capere non posset, &c.* And Ministers are grossly deceived to think the Fathers speak of a figure or trope in Rhetorick, it is manifestly apparent they speak of a figure in nature; that figure or shape, which accompanies natural things, which in this mysterious Sacrament is made by the power of God to accompany another substance. So that here the appearance of natural bread is no more the figure of bread, as naturally it is, but the figure now of our Lords blessed body, couched by the power of God under that appearance, which is naturally the figure of wine and bread. And a figure of the body it could not be, unless the substance of that body were really

T



really and truly there under that figure or appearance; *Figura non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.*

But in Peter Lombards time, Transubstantiation was so far from being an article of Catholik faith, that they did not know whether it were true or no, as appears by the same authour in his 4. book and eleventh distinction: so that it made haste to pass in the Lateran Council for faith, which about fifty years before, in Lombards time, was but a new disputable opinion. Your Disswader had done wisely, if he had produced for himself, as frequently he does, only some obscure authours, which seldom fall into mens hands. But Peter Lombard the master of sentences, is an authour so known by all, and in every mans hand, that your Disswader, had he not utterly abandoned both honesty and reason too, had never mentioned him. For this great master from his eight to the fourteen distinction of his fourth book, doth with all solidity and art, so declare and confirm the real presence in this Sacrament of the Altar, and the conversion of the elements by Gods powerful word into the very substance of our Lords body, as a great article of ancient Christian faith, that nothing can be said either more solidly, or with more earnest resolution. But, *Quem Deus vult perdere, dementat.* After your Disswader had wilfully thrown away his honesty, God in his just judgment so darkened his

his reason, that he could not so much as heed what he said. There I say that learned Catholik Doctour does industriously and in a copious manner in thirty whole pages together according to the edition I have by me, printed at Colen, both declare and establish that Catholik Christianity of the real presence, and transmutation of the elements into Christs sacred body, answering and clearing many things which hereticks and pagan philosophers might object against it. And your Disswader takes hold of one of the philosophical objections, which the great master presently solves, for an argument of the masters own doubting; although he could not but see him assert, declare and establish the contrary, the real presence I mean, and miraculous mutation of the elements into the substance of our Lords flesh and blood, in all that his copious and learned discours, both before and after that objection. O unhappy Kingdom of ours, by these lying fals teachers so woefully misled. This one only passage, which any one that hath but a mediocrity of learning may see with his own eyes, may suffice to show what a man your Disswader is, and how little to be credited. But whom God will overthrow for his grand misdemeanours, him he in his justice blindeth. I could find in my heart to give here an abridgment of all that great masters discours concerning this Sacrament of the altar, as he

there calls it. But it is somewhat besides my way, and I have already been too long. *Qui legit intelligat.*

The great weight and importance of this business hath made me speak something more of it, than I shall of other things. That I may therefore here recapitulate in brief, what I have hitherto said to manifest your Disswaders insignificancy, and to speak plainly, his impertinency in this point: First he is faulty, in that he never declares this business of Transubstantiation, what it is, or what it means in the beleef and judgment of that Roman Church he opposes: Secondly, that he makes all the Popish Decourses which he mentions concerning it, to speak against it, and to disown it, whatever he meant by it, and not any one of them to speak for it, or profes it. And how then is it Popish or Poperie. Thirdly, that he sayes in the beginning of his section, *that the piece of Poperie he here writes against was first determined in the Council of Lateran*, and yet but two pages after, forgetting himself, he sayes, *that the opinion was not determined in the Lateran, as it is now held in Rome*: and yet never expresses how it is now held in Rome, or what that is which is now held in Rome contrary to the Council, or by whom, or in what manner. Fourthly, because the business of the *real Presence*, which Protestants love to call Transubstantiation, that they may

may play with that fine long ginglyng word, as children with a rattle, is not touched at all by him. And yet that is all the substance of Popery in this point: which, that Berengarius the heretick, together with his associates might fully acknowledg without any slight of the manifold evasions used by him, this word was invented by the Prelates of the Conncel, as was Consubstantiation by those of Nice, for a firmer establishment of Catholick Tradition, and ancient truth. So that your Disswader here touches but the lid and rind, not the heart and substance of Popery, which he is afraid indeed to deal with. And being weak in sence, he playes with words.

§. 6. *Which is against Popish Communion.*

“ Sayes, that the half-communion is another  
 “ Innovation in Popery, swerving from the  
 “ Apostles practice, and Christs Institution:  
 “ as appears in the Popish Councel of Con-  
 “ stance, where it is decreed, though Christ in-  
 “ stituted, and primitive Christians received in  
 “ both kinds, yet that no Priest under pain of  
 “ Excommunication should communicate the  
 “ people under both kinds, which is a bold af-  
 “ front to Christ himself: although even their  
 “ own Cassander and Aquinas teach, that to be  
 “ the ancient custom of the Church, and Pas-  
 “ chasius resolves it dogmatically, that the one  
 “ is not to be communicated without the other.

This business, Sir, is more amply discussed and cleared in my *Fiat Lux*, which you have by you. If you do but read that, I shall have here less to say. But know Sir, that this business touches not any unalterable dogme of faith, but an alterable use and practice, as shall be declared by and by: and therefore is it not to be called Popery, upon that account. And a change in such things is so far from blame, that it is oftentimes necessary; so long as the substance of Religion is preserved intire, as here it is. Christians are to fast after the departure of the Espouse: and set times therefore to be appointed, that such a good work be not in the Church of God utterly neglected: yet the dayes and times are some of them for urgent reasons altered. They did fast on Wednesdays and not Saturdays in many places; now on Saturdays not Wednesdays. Christians did stand at their Liturgy all Paschall time; now they kneel. Little children were in old time communicated after Baptisme in many places of the Catholik world; now no where. Absolution is now given upon an humble confession and a promise either exprest or tacite of performing the due penance; but it could not be in ancient times obtained, till the penance was fulfilled. Priests may be consecrated now at twenty five years old, in former times not till thirty. Many holy dayes were then kept, which now cannot: Many now, which

which could not then. Communion was oftner in some ages, than it is now. There is a reason for all these changes of discipline and custom. But the substance of Religion remains ever the same, about Fasts, Liturgy, Baptism, Penance, Confession, Priesthood, Feasts, Communion, and such like things, though some circumstance may change. So concerning this point of the Eucharist the substance of Religion is, that in memory of our blessed Lords Passion, a benediction or consecration of bread and wine be made in the Church of God by his Priests for ever, until our Lords second coming: to the end that the Church his spouse may ever have his body with her to feed upon. This I say is the substance of religion in this point. But some circumstances, such as may, will change. For example, Priests rarely celebrated in some times of the Church, but yet when any Mass or Messach was kept by any one of them, all the other Priests and Clergy-men that were near would assuredly be present at it, and hear and pray, and meditate with other people in most humble and fervent manner, as became all good Christians to do: but now in this last age they go generally every one to the Altar daily. Which custom is the better, I will not here determine. But I am sure, that great S. Francis commanded all his children to hear Mass once a day both Priests and others; but forbade those that were

Priests every day to celebrate; and I think he had the Spirit of God in him: In old times all Christian Priests had their head covered at the Altar with an *Amictus* or amice of pure linnen, now they generally let it fall into their neck, and their heads are utterly bare. And time will come, that they will put it upon their heads again. So likewise for good and just reasons, were catholik people in som times and places communicated in the one kind, and som time in the other, and som time and place in both. But they were never de-  
 hard Communion; nor was ever the Sacrifice of the Altar stopped. Nor is it so indifferent a circumstance to consecrate or celebrate in one kind, as it is in one kind to communicate. For Communion respects the thing contained, the body and blood of Christ, which was ever be-  
 lieved to be equally present in either kind. But the sacrifice or consecration in one kind would not figure our Lords death and passion, and the effusion of his blood, as it ought to do. But this great Christian work of sacrificing, which is essential Religion, and the very characteristical badg of Christianity, becaus our Protestant Reformers cast it off, they talk ever since, only of Communion of lay-people, as though the sacred benediction, or consecration and oblation, which indeed is the Christian sacrifice according to the rite and figure of Melchisedek, recounted, admired, and worshipped by all primitive



primitive Christians, were instituted only for that end. Whereas indeed Christ our Lords institution touches immediately the figuration only of his death and passion, which is completely don in the sacrifice consummated by the Priest; although the peoples communion, unto whose comfort and benefit all that work of consecration is exercised in the Church, ought to follow by sequel, when it is necessary or expedient.

Now the ancient primitive Church so firmly beleevd, that the blessed body and blood, and whole humanity and divinity of Christ, were so present to those sacred symbols after the benediction or consecration of them by their Priests in Christs name and vertue, tho it be unconceivable and wholly ineffable unto us: that if a man with an indifferent and unprejudiced eye will but look back upon antiquity, he may plainly see, that in all ages it was indifferent to Christians, though not to consecrate, yet to communicate either in one kind or both. For the younger people, and such as were sick, were generally communicated only in the liquid kind; and others, though som also received in both when solemn Communion was made, yet that in the very primitive times, they thought it all one to receive either in both or one, S. Cyprian, S. Basil, and Tertullian, very ancient Priests and Fathers do abundantly witness. For Tertullian in his book *de oratione*, describing the Christian  
ways

wayes of old, *Usque adeo accepto corpore*, saith he, *stationem liceret solvere* : that is, when they had communicated the body of their Lord, no mention made of the chalice, they brake up their station, and had their *Ite missa est*, to be gon; as it is now even at this day among Catholiks. And as for S. Basil, he in his epistle to Cæsarea Patricia, tells at large how Christians in those dayes communicated four times a week and oftner, if a Martyrs feast chanced to fall in the week: and how, that if persecution happened so violent, that a Priest could not be had to give the people Communion, they were forced with their own hands to touch that sacred body, which was consecrated and kept in *ciborium's*, boxes or pixis for them. And this the peoples irreverence of touching the sacred body, good S. Basil labours to excuse, both by the urgency of their devotion and need; and also by the example of the Hermits, who leading a monastical life, for want of Priests at that time among them, kept the sacred Communion in their cells, and received it with their own hands, touching it, contrary to the general custom, when devotion and piety required: as also by that of the Christians in Alexandria, and Egypt, who in such times of persecution and danger, would have the sacred Communion at home in their own houses, lest upon any necessity they should chance to dye without it: and lastly by the very custom

custom of Priests in the Church, who then so delivered the host to communicants, that when it was put by the Priests into their mouths, they touched som part of it, who received it, with their own hands. All this S. Basil there discourses more at large: which agree well to the consecrated bread, thus touched by the people in time of necessity, thus put into their mouths by the help of the Priests and their own hands, thus kept at home in times of persecution, thus reserved in pixes or little arks, but not at all to the chalice. And all those devout Christians, thought themselves sufficiently communicated in one kind, who understood Christianity as well surely, as we do now abov a thousand years after them. St. Cyprian likewise in his book *de lapsis*, has much to the same purpos, giving us also to understand by his testimony, that those ancient Christians for fear of death, and the grievances of persecution, had usually the Sacrament kept by them in a Repository or Ark in their houses, which with all devout reverence when they were necessitated to it, they put with their own hands into their mouths, and participated on such like occasion, although by general custom it used to be put into their mouths by the hands of Priests. And he relates amongst other things a frightful story of a certain woman, who for fear or other weaknes had complied to the idol sacrifices: and when she came home, to repent and

and humble her self in her Oratory, and by holy communion both to expiate that her transgression, and strengthen her against the like temptation, as soon as she had opened her *Ciborium* or *Pixis*, wherein the body of her Lord and Redeemer was kept, a terrible flash of fire issuing thence upon her, did so affright her, that she durst not touch it. *Quandam*, saith he, *mulierem sacrificii idolorum contaminatam, cum Repositorium seu Arcam suam, in qua sanctum Domini posuerat, manibus pollutis tentasset aperire, ignis efflans eam terruit, nec tangere erat ausa.* This and much more might be brought to witnes, that primitive Christians thought themselves completely communicated in one kind, and this very kind that is now in use amongst Catholics. But I must come to your Doctor.

*Half-Communion*, saith he, *is another Popish novelty, whereby they deprive the people of Christs blood.* Sir, it they eat in memory that Christ died for them, which they do, and which in all Protestancy makes a perfect communion, how are they deprived of his blood. Can they beleev his death and passion without faith of his blood shed for them? *But they ought to have wine as well as bread.* So they have: as much as the Disswader and his Church allows their people, whereby they may feed upon Christ, who shed his blood for us, *in their heart by faith with thanksgiving; and which as your Disswader here*  
speaks,

speaks, may make Christs body and blood present to them by *sacramental consequence*. And how is it then a half-communication? *O but the wine is not the blood of Christ*. Not carnally as your Dissvader speaks of his Sacrament, but it is so by sacramental consequence. It is as much then as yours the blood of Christ. And how is it then a half-communication, and yours a whole one? *O but their bread is beleev'd to be the body of Christ*. So it is; but yours is not. And therfor if theirs be but a half-communication, yours is none at all. But how good Doctour *Disswative* is half-communication either new Popery, or old Popery, or any Popery at all? Roman Catholiks or Papists use no such word: nor do they own any such thing as *Half-Communion*. They beleev and call it a whole Communion. Is it lawful for you to forge a Popery of your own, and then put it upon them; who neither in thought, word, or any of their writings profess any such thing. *But is not Communion in one kind all one with Half-Communion?* No, Sir, it is not all one. It differs as much as half and whole. And that I think is something. It is a whole Communion Sir, both in the tenour of their beleef, and according to that of yours. And why then should you call it a *half-communication*? According to theirs, whole Christ is equally present under either of those figures or appearances: and therfor according to their faith

saith it is a whole Communion. And according to yours it is no less. When you your selves give the bread to your people, and say, *Take this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed upon him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving,* you do not intend I suppose, nor do the people mean to feed only upon one half of him. Why then would your Disswader injuriously misname that a half-communion, which in all opinions is a whole one. Neither Catholiks nor Protestants feed upon the signs but thing signified. This difference too there is, that Catholiks have all the mystery of the passion represented to them in their sacrifice, and the presence of the whole Lord in their Communion. But Protestants have no such thing; although the mystery be preacht to them. And therfor is the Catholik not a half but whole Communion; and that of the Protestants may well be doubted, whether it be any Communion at all, though it be a whole Sermon. For how can any one discern the Lords body there, where in reality it is not? If your Disswader had a candour becoming a gentleman, he would neither falsifie the wayes, nor misname the practice of any Religion. But be it as it is. Since Papists, as he will have them called, have equally used the Communion in the liquid kind alone, as this in only the other, why should he call one of them more than the other by the name of Popery.

And

And why is not Communion in both kinds, which he acknowledges to have been more in use amongst them, and proves it by the testimony of their own popish doctours, be rather Popery than either of the other. *O but this half-communication began but in the Council of Constance.* I have sufficiently shown you, Sir, that the custom was in the world, before the City of Constance knew what Christianity were.

And even this Council of Constance is perverted by the Disswader too: as if he had sworn to act nothing sincerely. That business in the Council was thus. Petrus Dresdensis, and other associates of Huz, had taught publickly, and with much scandal, that the Eucharist is necessarily to be given to lay-people after supper, and in both kinds. This doctrine and practice of theirs was censured by the Council, which at one and the same time declared those two circumstances of communicating in both kinds and after supper, not to be of necessary obligation, because the Canons and approved ancient custom of the Church, had never looked upon those two circumstances, as of necessity to be observed. But what does your Disswader here? First he sets down the Councils resolution in direct opposition to Christ. *Whereas Christ instituted, &c. yet we command contrary, &c.* as though the Council had absolutely annulled Christs institution: which notwithstanding



standing they acknowledg and allow for good : and only declare the two said circumstances in that institution of our Lord, not to be of that necessity as the substance of the institution it self, giving for their reason for it, which your Disswader thinks not good to take notice of, that the Canons and ancient custom of the Church had sufficiently made manifest, that those two circumstances of communicating at night and in both kinds were not necessary, by allowing the contrary practice in primitive times. Secondly, whereas the Council joyned both the circumstances together, namely of communicating in both kinds and after supper, he quite leaves out that of receiving after supper : because it would as much have inferred the Protestant practice to be against Christs institution as the Popish is : and so his talk would either have been of no value, or against himself. Thirdly, whereas the Council declared only against the opinion which those Hereticks had of the necessity of those two circumstances, and corresponding practice, he makes them to condemn not their necessity, but the circumstances themselves, which the Council never thought of. Fourthly, he delivers that Councils declaration against those circumstances, as if it had been a dogme of faith, and consequently Popery or Catholik Religion, whereas it was delivered in order to the circumstances them-

themselves but as a temporal law and decree, though in order to the necessity of those circumstances it be a constant Catholik truth. And therfor the Council of Basil, which a little after determined the same doctrin, namely that Priests are not bound to communicate the people in both kinds, whereof they also give the reason, *quia certa fide tenendum est, quod sub specie panis non tantum caro, & sub specie vini non sanguis tantum, sed sub qualibet specie Christus totus continetur, sess. 30;* yet they allowed the Bohemians and Moravians, who desiring to submit to the Catholik Church, and yet in their weaknes could not comply with that custom, to be communicated in both kinds. These four are shifts of much insincerity, but I must bear with him. His other authorities against this Catholik custom now generally in use, may be easily understood by what I have hitherto spoken what they mean. But that of Paschasius I cannot but give you notice of it. For Paschasius speaking of one certain ceremony in the Priests celebration of Mass, wherein he drops a piece of the host into the consecrated chalice. *Very rightly, saith he, is the flesh sociated with the blood, becaus neither the flesh without the blood, &c.* And a little after, *Therfor, saith he, they are well put together in the chalice, becaus from one cup of Christs Passion, &c.* From those words, which speak only the Priests action in  
V the

the sacrifice of Mass, your Protestant Disswader would prove his communion of people in both kinds, of which Paschasius neither spoke nor thought. Is he not hard put to it think you? or is he ignorant rather of what he speaks. But he is gon to his next section, and I must follow him.

§. 7. *Which is against Service in an unknown Tongue.*

“ Sayes, that the Roman Church offends no  
 “ less in another of their Novelties, of using an  
 “ unknown tongue in their Service; which use  
 “ can no more be reconciled with Saint Pauls  
 “ fourteenth chapter to the Corinthians, than  
 “ adultery with the seventh Commandment:  
 “ and Origen, Ambrose, Basil, Chrysostom,  
 “ Austin, Aquinas also and Lyra speak all a-  
 “ gainst it: no less also the Civil and Canon  
 “ Law. Indeed what profit can he receiv, who  
 “ hears a sound and understands it not: a dumb  
 “ Priest would serve as well: for God under-  
 “ stands his thoughts. The popish people that  
 “ pray in their churches they know not what, can  
 “ have no affection, becaus they have no under-  
 “ standing of their own prayers. Therefore let  
 “ every tongue prais the Lord.

Here the Disswader, that he may the better  
 expresse the confusion and darknes that is in  
 this popish custom, which he means here to  
 speak against, uses a confused and dark speech  
 of

of his own, and confutes it rather by emblem than reason. His reader no doubt will imagin, or els the Diffwader fails of his end, that Roman Catholiks *do not understand their own prayers in the Church*; that God is not praised by them in every tongue; that they are not at all edified by their Liturgy or Mass; that they joyn not their desires, nor understand what they say or ask of God; that their heart sayes nothing nor asks for nothing, and therfor receivys nothing; that they understand not in particular, what they should desire or beg of God; that their own souls have not any benefit by their prayers; and that the Church will not suffer them to be brought out of their intollerable ignorance. All these things are jumblingly said and asserted in this his section against the Roman liturgy, & must as he hopes be beleevd by his reader. But ther is not a Roman catholik in the world, however ignorant and simple he be, but will be ready to tell your Diffwader to his face, that ther is not of all this, any one word of it true. But he imagines that Roman Catholiks come to Church like Frotestants, there standing or sitting, and looking upon one another, till a black-coat comes to read som prayers in their ears. But in this he is grossly mistaken, as all Catholiks know, though others do not. They have their obsecrations, their meditations, their postulations, their psalms, their ejaculations, which humbly upon their knees they

pour forth to their Redeemer, both while their priest is with them at the altar ; and before, and after too. Nor is there a blessed sight to be seen on earth, than devout Catholicks in a Church ; whereas others stand or sit, gazing about, till the *Parson* comes to make use of their ears, neither heart, nor lip, nor hand, nor knee, nor breast being to them of any use. And this every one would understand as well as I, if he understood Catholik customs and religion as I do. Nor does the Priest come to the altar to teach the people what they should say, but to pray and make an atonement for them. And in his confession, entrance, hymn of *glory to God on high*, prayer, epistle and gospel, and his whole work of consecration and offering, they go along with him in their meditations, humiliations and requests, understanding all the whole matter and business of that heavenly devotion, though they hear not his particular words, which it would be all one to them, whether they were in latin or in the mother tongue. I know alas, I speak but in vain, to such as are brought up in another way, and by fallacious flights of ministers are lead into a misconceit of the ancient religion of this Land ; which till they see it again, they can hardly ever rightly understand. Prejudice is a lecture almost unremovable. And it concerns ministers, that such a prejudice should be continually rivetted  
into

into peoples minds, who must either be deceived, or ministers undone. But he that sees Catholik people at their devotions, and Protestants at theirs, would, if he be any wayes disinterested, conclude with himself, that Catholik people serv God in earnest, Protestants but in jeast.

Truth is, the Catholik Liturgy is only a representation of Christs death and passion, which our Lord appointed should be exhibited to the eyes of his beleivers, so long as the world shall last: that coming still together, they may worship there their crucified Lord, and pour forth in him all their requests, every one according to their several necessities. So that the priest and peoples great work is soon ended; the consecration, lifting up the host and chalice, and adoration, being all accomplished in half a quarter of an hour: and in som Churches, that especially of Ethiopia, in yet lesser time. And all the prayers and meditations, and what other things the Priest either speaks with his lips or heart besides, are only to dispose himself, before and after that great work. And in all times have Christian people ever made it their special care, to furnish themselves with such meditations and affections, as that their solemn work of adoration requires. I find in my heart here to set down the way I have been taught to hear Mass, and which I

practise my self. Such an ocular pattern would I am sure give more satisfaction to my countrymen, than any general words I can speak concerning it. But I shall have som better place for that hereafter.

The testimony of authorities which your Disswader brings against this Roman custom of one and the same language all over the world, which he calls an unknown tongue, either speak nothing at all to that busines, or say nothing but what Papists say themselves; and many of them by his usual trick either of total falsity, or partial depravation, are made by your Disswader to speak against a custom, which they never so much as dreamed to impugn. If Origen say, that the *Grecians in their prayers use Greek, and the Romans the Roman language, &c.* so say all Papists too. The Maronites with some others use the Hebrew Liturgy, Grecians the Greek, and Western Christians the Roman; and so every one in his own tongue, that is proper to that part of the Church wherof he is a member, prayeth and praiseth God. And yet it was never thought necessary that any people in the Christian world should have their Liturgy in their mother tongue. Again, if St. Ambrose say, *when people meet for edification in the Church, things ought to be spoken which hearers understand:* so say, and so do Papists also. For all their Sermons, which are made for edification, are ever  
in



in the mother tongue, or vulgar language of the Countrey; and in so plain a manner they either are or should be uttered, that hearers may understand and edifie thereby. But the Christian sacrifice is offered up to God, not for the peoples edification or instruction, but for their reconciliation and peace. Likewise if S. Jerom and Ulphilas *translated the Bible*: so has it been translated by several other Priests since their time, I beleev into all languages of the world, and is continually read and expounded in Catholik Countreys, now one mystery of it, then another, unto peoples constant edification. But this infers not that it ever was or ought to be read in the Churches, one chapter after another, instead of their Liturgy. No such thing did antiquity ever hear of. If the civil law of Justinian ordain *all byshaps and Priests to celebrate the sacred oblation not in a low voice, but with a loud clear voice, which may be heard by people*: so do Roman Priests at this day act all according to that Canon. But how came the first reforming Protestants to leave off the name of Priests, but only because they had no such sacred oblation, which was abolished by them, any longer now to make. Again, if there issued from Pope Innocent the third, a precept or decree in the Council of Lateran, *that in the same city, as your Disswader here speaks, thinking it I beleev to be som City called Lateran, where people*

had then met together from several parts of the world, service should be celebrated according to the diversity of ceremonies and languages; no doubt but that precept or decree was then observed throughout all the City of Rome, where that Council was kept. And the Maronites with their adherents, had the sacred Liturgy in Chaldee or Hebrew, the Grecians in Greek, others in Latin, with such variety of ceremonies therein, as was used in these several nations, though they acted the same thing in substance. So that such as came from Syria, Egypt, or Greece, were not bound to be present at the Latin Liturgy, although they were then in Rome; nor yet the Romans to the Hebrew or Greek Mass. And if any were met there from our English Sarum Church, they might use their Sarum Missal, and not that of the Roman Dioces, although it might have shorter, or perhaps longer gradualls, more or fewer meditations, or differing evangiles, or a longer solemnity of consecration. This difference is still in the world amongst Roman Catholiks at this day, and ever was and will be, although the whole substance of their Messach or Liturgy be every where the same. And for this reason a Dominican Fryar, now deceased, coming over some years ago into England, becaus he began his Mass with *Confitemini Domino*, after the manner of the Dominicans, and not with the usual

usual psalm, *Judica me Deus*, although they had patience with him till he had ended, yet the women that were present at it, got together afterwards, and in their indiscreet zeal fell upon him, and beat him for a counterfeit. And if the Council be of any force here, (otherwise why is it brought) then are Catholiks according to that Council to celebrate in the very same city here with Protestants without controul, though they use diversity of ceremonies and languages. All these authorities then, make nothing against this piece of Popery, but rather confirm it. And the glosses which your Disswader makes upon them, and all his insulting invectives, are but the froth of his own evil will.

When your Disswader tells us further, that Basil, Chrysostome, Ambrose, Austin, Aquinas and Lyra speak against Service in an unknown tongue, as unapt to edifie; the atorenamed Catholik Gentlemen, who have endeavoured with all care to search the Libraries for a trial of your Disswaders honesty, have found in some of those Fathers no such book as your Disswader cites, and in none of them any such words. Which I am apt to beleev, not only by reason of the industrious sincerity of the said Gentlemen, and palpable insincerity of this Disswader, but for other special reasons drawn from the authors themselves. For St. Basil and St. Chrysostome, St. Austin and St. Ambrose, the  
two

two first were Greek Priests that used a Greek Liturgy of their own, one of them an Archbishop or Patriarch, the other a monk; the two last, S. Ambrose a Priest and Bishop of Millain in Italy, S. Austin the like in Africa, and founder of the Augustin Canons regulars, and Hermits, used a Latin one: both which differed even in their times from the vulgar language of their respective places. And Aquinas and Lyra are manifestly known to be later popish Priests and Friars, using one and the same Latin Liturgy, differing from the languages of England and Spain. As also because it is unlikely, they would use this Disswaders reason, *because such unknown tongues in the liturgy would not edifie.* For though edification in a large sence may well agree with the Mass or Liturgy; in that, it excites holy and heavenly affections; yet in its proper sence it is the effect of sermons and good preachers, edifying the people by their holy lives and wholsom doctrine, unto an emulation and care of observing what those people see and hear so frequently taught and practised by their pious preachers.

Those words of S. Chrysostom, *If one speak in an unknown tongue, he is a barbarian to himself and others,* are absolutely true. For so, if an Embassadour, or any other here in England, should chatter words which neither himself nor  
others

others understand, he would be a barbarian both to others and to himself too. But when your Disswader sayes, that *S. Chrysostom* spake so, in order to a form of prayer, and urging the *Apostles precept* for it, he wrongs him wretchedly. For he does it not; nor can such a saying have any place in such a busines. For the priest speaks not in his liturgy to the people, as your Disswader simply imagines, but to God, where both speaker and hearer understand. But the testimony of *Lyra* who is made to say, that in the primitive Church *all things were done in a vulgar language*, is falsified in the very substance. For he sayes not *omnia* all things, but *communia* common things, some parts in Baptism, where the godfather or godmother makes a profession of faith; something in churchings of women, benedictions, marriages, and such like, as is yet in use amongst Papists at this day, were so done. So that all the contents of this section, the testimonies your Disswader brings against this Catholik custom, and your Disswaders own insultings, which I set down in the beginning, together with his glosses upon those testimonies, are either absolutely fals or totally impertinent, and in one word unconscionably slanderous.

But it is as possibly, saith he, to reconcile adultery with the seventh Commandment, as Church service in a language not understood, to the fourteenth

teenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. And is it so? Let us look then into that strange fourteenth Chapter; and see what it sayes.

1. Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that you may prophesie. 2. For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God, for no man understandeth him: however in the spirit he speaketh mysteries. 3. But he that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification, exhortation, and comfort. 4. He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself: but he that prophesieth edifieth the Church. 5. I would that you all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret that the Church may receive edifying. 6. Now brethren if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you except I shall speak to you either by revelation or by knowledg, or by prophesying or by doctrine. 7. And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction of the sound, how shall it be known what is piped or harped. 8. For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle? 9. So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue words easie to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for he shall speak unto the air. 10. There are it may be so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them are without signifi-  
cation.

cation. 11. Therfor if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me. 12. Even so ye forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excell to the edifying of the Church. 13. Wherefor let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue, pray that he may interpret. 14. For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayes, but my understanding is unfruitful. 15. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, I will pray with the understanding also. 16. Els when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen to thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? 17. For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified. 18. I thank my God I speak with tongues more than you all. 19. Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, than by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue. 20. Brethren, be not children in understanding, howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding men. 21. In the law it is written, with men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people: and yet for all that, will they not hear me saith the Lord. 22. Wherefore tongues are for a sign not to them that beleeve, but to them that beleeve not: but prophesying serveth not to them that beleeve not, but to them who beleeve. 23. If therfor the whole Church be come  
toget-



together in som place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad? 24. But if all prophesie, and there come in one that beleeveth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. 25. And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest, and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth. 26. How is it then brethren, when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrin, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation: let all things be done to edifying. 27. If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by cours, and let one interpret. 28. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church, and let him speak to himself and to God. 29. Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other judg. 30. And if any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace. 31. For ye may all prophesie one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted. 32. And the spirit of the prophets are subject to the prophets. 33. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all Churches of the Saints I reach. 34. Let your women keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted to them to speak, but they are to be under obedience, as also saith the law. 35. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for

for a woman to speak in the Church. 36. What, came the word of God out from you, or came it unto you only? 37. If any think himself a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledg that the things I write unto you are the commandments of God the Lord. 38. But if any be ignorant, let him be ignorant. 39. Wherefore brethren covet to prophesie, and forbid not to speak with tongues. 40. Let all things be done decently and in order. Thus runs this fourteenth Chapter in your own translation. And if it do nothing at all concern Church-service, why should the Roman Liturgy be reconciled to it, any more than adultery to the third commandment? Or what disparagement is it to this service, that it cannot be reconciled to that law which no way concerns it: If it do concern Church-service, then must all the Common prayer and Service of our Protestant Church of England be abolished; being as irreconcilable to this rule, as you say adultery is to the seventh Commandment. Say which you please. If it concern not any Church-service, you justify as to this account the custom of the Roman Church: if you say it do, you condemn your own.

Truth is, the Spirit of our Lord magnified his primitive Church, when it began to spread and appear in the world, with many particular graces; that the Jew and Pagan might discern in it something extraordinary, and by that exte-  
riour

riour sign be induced to beleev that the founder of that Religion was no ordinary person: as gift of miracles, tongues, and prophecies. The new converts of Corinth seemed to be more pleased with the gift of tongues, than any other; and when they met together, fell a gabbling all at once, not two or three only, but more, and perhaps the greatest part of them, all at one and the same time, as the Apostle here intimates, v. 23. one for example in the Congo language; the other that of Mexico, one Ethiopian, the other Arabian, one the Indian, another the Slavonian: and none understood another, nor could well hear one another for the confused noise, as we may gather by v. 2. and v. 11. and so became barbarians to one another. This gift then and special grace of Gods Spirit, though it might astonish a Pagan, that should look upon them, which was all that holy Spirit intended by it; yet it could not edifie him any further, or move him, if he should be left to himself, to think otherwise of them, than that they were a company of mad gabbling distracted people; especially when he considered that some of them seemed to exhort, some to sing, some to pray, and all in a cluster at one and the same time, no man heeding the other, or understanding a word he said, if he should. And this disorder the Apostle here labours to rectifie in this whole fourteenth chapter.

chapter. And it is manifest, that the apostle here neither spake nor thought of any Church-service either in one language or other; but only of that temporal gift which is now past away long ago with the people that had it. Nor can it prudently be applied to any Church-service that I know in the world. For there is no such doing any where. Much less can it relate to any custom of the Roman Church; where all the people are devoutly praying to one and the same God, in quiet and silence, both in spirit and understanding, heart and mind too; the priest knowing what himself speaks or prays; and the people understanding both what he acts and does in their behalf and his own, and what also they beg of God themselves, either with words or without them. So that here is no kind of parity at all.

Nay, if neither the Priest did understand himself what he speaks, nor the people what they pray, both which are absolutely fals, yet would the Apostle allow even that, as a good custom, though not so perfect; so long as the words contained piety, and the heart stood piously affected in pronouncing them. *He that speaketh in an unknown tongue, saith he v. 2. speaketh not to men but to God, and though man understand not, yet in spirit he speaketh mysteries.* And again v. 4. he saith, that such an one edifieth himself: and v. 14. he teaches, that such a

ones spirit prayeth, though his mind or understanding doth not: and v. 17. that he gives thanks well. With these of our learned Apostle your Disswaders words throughout this his section, are I am sure absolutely irreconcilable. For he saith, such an one *prayer only with his lips, and not in spirit*; that there is *neither affection nor edification in any such prayer*; and that the *heart and spirit sayes nothing and asks for nothing*; and so receives nothing, which Salomon calls the sacrifice of fools; thus speaks your Disswader quite contrary to Apostolical sobriety. And not that custom, I should think, but your Disswaders invectives against it are irreconcilable with this fourteenth chapter. Saint Paul sayes, that *such a one prays in spirit*; the Disswader, that *he prays onely in his lips*. Saint Paul, that *he edifies himself*; the Disswader, that *his soul has no benefit*, and that there is *neither edification, nor affection, or any good by such prayers*. Saint Paul, that *he prays well*, and *gives thanks well*; the Disswader, that *he does ill*. But I need not stand upon this now. There is no such thing in the use of the Roman Liturgy, where priests and people pray both in spirit and mind too, both with heart and understanding also.

Only let me tell you thus much, that St. Paul in one verse of this chapter checks your Disswader and all his whole discours in this section:

Lin-

*Lingulis loqui nolite prohibere*, saith he v. 39. Do not forbid to speak with tongues. But your Disswader forbids, and labours here might and main against it. Doth the Apostle speak here of Church-service, or not? If he do, then Church-service in an unknown tongue is allowed: if he do not, then none of this chapter is against Church-service in an unknown tongue. Surely your Disswader did never ponder these things, as he ought. Nay, if this discours of the Apostle concern Church-service, so that your Disswader hence may rightly gather, that the popish Mass in an unknown tongue is irreconcilable with it, I may upon the same ground prove more strongly, that S. Paul would have the popish Mass in an unknown tongue to be practised; *Volo omnes vos linguis loqui*, saith he v. 5. *I will that ye all speak with tongues*; or *I would that you all spake with tongues*: which is according to your Disswaders meaning, *I will have you all turn Papists, or I would ye were all turned Papists.*

But lastly, if this 14. chapter to the Corinthians be to be understood of Church-service and Church-preaching and Church-praying, as this dissuading Doctour would have it, then Sir must our Protestant pulpits and service-pews all down; and the Quakers way must come up infallibly. For what saith the text here. *Sive lingua quis loquitur, secundum duos aut ad multum*

tres, & per partes; & unus interpretetur: si autem non fuerit interpres, taceat in ecclesia, sibi autem loquatur & Deo. Propheta autem duo & tres dicant, & ceteri dijudicent. Quod si alii revelatum fuerit sedenti, prior taceat. Potestis enim omnes per singulos prophetari, ut omnes discant & omnes exhortentur. Et spiritus prophetarum prophetis subjecti sunt. This is the great result of this whole chapter: and the very utmost that the Quakers would have; and what they practice daily in their meetings. If any speak in a tongue, saith the Apostle, let it be by two, or at most by three, and that by cours; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church, and speak to himself and God. Let the Prophets speak two or three, and let the other judg; and if any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace; for ye may all prophesie one by one; that all may learn, and all be exhorted or comforted. And the spirit of the prophets are subject to Prophets. Let your Disswader now speak what he thinks; but speak it openly, that the good Quaker may as well hear him as the Papist: and speak it so effectually, that as far as in him lies, all the whole three Kingdoms may be perswaded, that this chapter concerns the publick Service of the Church. If this were once done, I beleev there would not be ere long so much as one byshop or minister left in the Land. And it were a less damage to  
your



your Diffwader, that adultery were reconciled to the seventh Commandment, than Church-service to his fourteenth Chapter of Corinthians.

Why ther is a language used in the Catholik liturgy, which though it be not the tongue of any one Countrey, yet it is the most universally known language of the whole Catholik family upon earth, is sufficiently discoursed in *Fiat Lux*. I need not stand here to repeat it. I must go on.

§. 8. *Which is about Images.*

“ Sayes, that Image-worship, wherin Papists  
 “ give the same worship to the pictures as is due  
 “ to the thing represented, is another novelty,  
 “ and that a heathenish one too, brought in first  
 “ by Simon Magus, and then the Gnosticks,  
 “ against which writes Clemens Alexandrinus,  
 “ and others: insomuch that S. Cyril in the time  
 “ of Emperour Julian, denies that Christians  
 “ did worship the Cross, and Epiphanius is  
 “ said to have cut in pieces a cloth picture,  
 “ wherin was the image of Christ or some  
 “ Saint. And therefore the decrees of the  
 “ second Nicen Synod which had approved ima-  
 “ ges, was abrogated by another general Coun-  
 “ cel at Frankford; a little after which Coun-  
 “ cel, the Emperour sent Claudius a godly  
 “ preacher to preach against Images in Italy.  
 “ And well he might, for the Council of Eli-

beris had long before that time declared against them. And all the devices of Roman writers to palliate this crime are frivolous; for the pure primitive times would not allow the making of Images, as witness Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and Origen.

Here is much ado about a shadow. Whatsoever your Disswader could pick up, that might sound but like his purpos, is here in a general mass heaped up together, whether it do touch his purpos, or not at all concern it, or be haply against himself. Theodoret, forsooth, S. Austin and Irenæus, these must all testifie, that Simon Magus first brought images into the Church, wherof they have not any one such word. The same fathers with Epiphanius must accuse the Gnosticks and Carpocratians for the same thing; wheras they only blame them for placing the pictur of Jesus and S. Paul with Homer, Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and other Heathens. Clemens and Origen disown and write against heathens Idolatry. So that all this concerns not our purpos. The two Councels of Eliberis and Frankford are against him, and so is likewise S. Cyril who in the very place cited objects extrcam ignorance to Julian the Apostate, who had cast the Christians in the teeth with their worshipping a wooden Cross; which they would not do to great Jupiter, and their painting the images of it in their foreheads, and afore their houses.

houses. And Saint Cyril tells Julian, that the Cross put Christians in mind of the vertue and good which Christ their Lord had done and suffered for them, which the good Doctour calls the precious and health-giving wood. And we may see not only by S. Cyrils answer, but by the objections of the Apostate Julian, what manner of Christians ther were in those dayes, fourteen hundred years ago.

The Council of Eliberis was kept in Spain, in the time of Emperour Galerius, when many Christians by reason of the bitterness of persecution, sacrificed through fear unto the heathen gods, and much contumely was done all over the world, and especially in Spain, both to Christians themselves, and the holy Gospel, and all sacred things. Wherfor the Council laid heavy pennances on all such Christians as should so apostatize either into heathensme, heresie, or the notorious sin of adultery; and amongst other things, c. 36. ordained that no sacred pictures should be painied upon the walls, becaus namely there they stood fixed, and were liable to the contumely of pagans, wheras such as were in frames and tables, might easily be removed and put into a safe place. That Council of Eliberis, becaus they adjoyn not a reason unto their decree, may easily be mistaken; although the one may be discerned in the other, by a judicious and serious reader, *Ne quod colitur*

*aut adoratur, saith the Council, in parietibus de-  
pingatur.* For the picture properly speaking,  
terminates neither respect nor contumely, but  
the thing represented by it, which if it be di-  
vine, must not receiv contumely, if it can be  
helped, from wicked men.

But the Council of Frankford I cannot but  
wonder, why your Disswader should cite it as  
an enemy to Images. Did not that Council  
consist of Catholik or popish Prelates, 300. of  
them gathered together under the Legates of  
Pope Adrian the first; in which also the Em-  
perour Charles the Great, as stout a Champion  
of the Roman Church as any ever was in the  
world, was actually present. O but *Eginard,  
Hincmar, Amonius, Blondus, and others* testifie that  
the said Council of Frankford condemned the se-  
cond Nicen Synod, wherein images were establisht,  
calling it an *Antichristian assembly*. But how can  
this be thought probable, nay I may say possible,  
of those two Councils? being so near one an-  
other, that ther were not above eight or nine  
years space between them, and both of them  
under one and the same Pope Adrian the first.  
Can any beleev this, though twenty Eginards  
should say it? But he is not found indeed to  
speak ought of it. *Hincmar* sayes, that they of  
Frankford condemned the Synod assembled at  
Nice without the Popes authority. But that Nicen  
Synod was both assembled and confirmed by the  
autho-

authority of that very same Pope who called and ratified this of Frankford. Blondus sayes, that they *abrogated the seventh Synod, and the Felician heresie de tollendis imaginibus.* And none of them say, that they of Frankford called that Nicen Synod an Antichristian assembly, or that they published any book to that purpos. What strange confidence then is this of your Disswader, to talk thus at random, without book, and besides all rule, and against truth.

The occasion of assembling this Council of Frankford were the misdemeanours of Elipandus Byshop of Tolledo in Spain. For Fælix Urgelitanus his Countreyman having consulted Elipandus concerning that scholastick difficulty, *Whether Christ as man ought to be called the natural, or only the adoptive Son of God,* by means of his discours, and a book written by him upon that subject, beleevd and said against the ancient language of the Church, that Christ was to be held an adoptive child of God, and not his natural son. And these two, together with Claudius Taurinensis, who came to them from Italy, filled all Spain with the clamour. This act of theirs was fond as well as wicked. For though in the schools it might haply be held, that Christ as man is not the natural but only the adoptive Son of God, if that particle *as*, be taken for a note of reduplication; yet they could not be ignorant, that beleevers have nothing to do with such

such nice logical points. These conceive Christ altogether specifically, as he is in himself. And so they had ever beleev'd him to be the only begotten natural Son of God, and we all so many as are made partakers of his grace, adopted in him. And he that shall preach Christ to be *as man*, only his adoptive Son, whether that *as* of his be taken reduplicatively or specifically, he makes but an ass of himself and a knave to boot. But these three, though often admonished, yet would they not desist. And therfor in a Council at Ratisbone, Fælix by name was condemned, respect being then had to the person and dignity of the Archbyshop of Toledo, and the other Byshop. Fælix therfor was brought to the Emperour Charles his Court, who then wintered at Rhegium; where after a while, he humbly submitted to the Council, there then met together; and from thence sent to the presence of Pope Adrian, in the Cathedral of S. Peter he publicly acknowledged his errour, and returned home to his own City. Elipand when he heard of all this, grew more violent than before; and laboured not only with his whole endeavour to reclaim Fælix to his former errour, but by letters patent and large dated to all the Byshops of France and Germany, to draw those two Kingdoms to his opinion. Wherupon Fælix returned again to his vomit. And lest the infection should spread  
any

any farther, by the agreement of the Pope and Charles the Emperour, a Councel was called at Frankford. This was the very business and occasion of that Councel: wherby every one may discern himself not only the improbability, that the said Councel of Frankford, which purposely met together to maintain the honour of Christ, should deface his figures; but the falsity also of this your Disswader, who tells us, that a while after this Councel of Frankford, Ludovicus son to Charles the great, sent Claudius a famous Oratour to preach against images in Italy, p. 60. Whereas Claudius had troubled Italy and Spain too, three or four years before that Councel, nay before the Councel of Ratisbone, which was two years before, and his way was condemned with himself both at Ratisbone and Frankford too.

These things being so, how in the name of God comes your Disswader here against so much reason to aver, that the Councel of Frankford declared against images, that they condemned the second Nicen Synod, wherein the use of Images had been maintained, that they published a book wherein that Synod was declared Antichristian, and that Ludovicus Charlemains son sent down Claudius after that Councel to preach against Images in Italy. I know that other Protestants have been guilty too of some part of this his story; so far at least as to say in particular, that the  
Frank-



Frankford Council was against images. But they never set down any of that Councils declaration against them, nor is ther any extant. Binius, who set forth all the Councils at large, both shows and copiously proves, that the acts of the second Nicen Council were all confirmed in the Council of Frankford; which is also averred by Alanus, Surius, Vasquez, and several other learned men. And since it is likely enough, that something was done in this Council about Images, wherof ther is so much talk in the world, ther can nothing be thought more rational, than that Pope Adrian, whose legates presided in both the Councils, should according to the Churches custom send those decrees of Nice about the same time lately finished, unto the Council now at Frankford; that the definition of the Nicen Council might be made known to all the West, by their acceptation and promulgation at Frankford. Which also that it was absolutely done, and no other thing done but it, may sufficiently be gathered by the authority of the Council of Senon, which in the 14. of their decrees speaks thus: *Carolus magnus Francorum rex Christianissimus in Francofordiensi conventu, ejusdem erroris Iconomachorum suppressit insaniam quam infelicissimus quidam Felix in Gallias & Germanias invexerat.* And the same is ratified by Platina, who in the life of Pope Adrian, *Biennio post*, saith he, *Theophylactus &*

*See-*

*Stephanus Episcopi insignes Adriani nomine Francorum & Germanorum Synodum habuerunt, in qua & Synodus quam septimam Græci appellabant & hæresis Felicianæ de tollendis imaginibus abrogata est: as also by Paulus Emilius, who in his second book de gestis Francorum, speaking of that Council of Frankford, Et imaginibus, saith he, suus honor restitutus est.* The like may be proved out of Blondus in his Decads, Sabellicus his *Æneads*, Gablifsards Chronology, Alanus his Dialogues, Naucerus, &c. All which various testimonies joyned in one; together with the motives of that Frankford Council; the great procurer and protectour of that Council, Charles the great, an eminent Champion of the Roman Church; the Presidents of that Council, Theophylact and Stephen, legates of the same Pope Adrian, who had lately finished and confirmed the second Council of Nice, may suffice, I should think, to refute the trifling humour of this Disswader. But his confidence is greater in his readers light beleef, then either the weight or truth of his own words.

But *all the devices of Roman writers to palliate this their crime, he sayes, are frivolous.* What are these devices, and what is their crimes? Sir, where there is no crime, there needs not any palliating devices. Is it a crime to keep an image of Christ crucified for us, that we may be often put in mind of the good and vertue of his

his holy passion, and our fanſie aſſiſted and kept in at our prayers, within the compaſs of their object? This is the buſineſs Sir, ſpeak directly unto this, before you go any further. You will make all ſorts of prophane Images, either to ſome civil uſe or indifferent, or perhaps a naughty end. This is no crime with you. If it be, how comes it to paſs, that never any byſhop or other miniſter in England, who ſcribble with ſuch a ſtiff impertinency againſt Popiſh Images, have never laboured at all againſt theſe Proteſtant pictures. *O but Proteſtants do not worſhip theſe pictures.* Do they not? I would to God, that all good Catholiks could ſo heartily love, imitate, and worſhip thoſe bleſſed perſons re- preſented in their portraictures, as Proteſtants do theirs, who by ſuch amorous faces in their curious drefſes are brought, I fear, too often on their knees. Motives to filthy iniquity, they may ſtand; but representation of aſterity, of contemplation, of martyrdom, of divine extaſies, of charity, of our Lord Jeſus, and his Saints, theſe are popiſh, theſe are antichriſtian, theſe are abominable. If the God of holineſs will not have any ſacred figures to be made, ſurely he cannot allow laſcivious, prophane, and light ones. But though he do not, our Miniſters will. *O but the Papiſts give the ſame worſhip to the representation, and the thing represented.* This your Diſſwader may gather haply by his own

experience. For the figure of a King, a father, and a wife, if they do raise any affections or thoughts, these must needs be so much differing, as the persons represented are. For the shadow, figure, or representation, if we would speak according to right philosophy, neither does nor can terminate any such respect, though it may its own. For example, (that I may declare this my speech) put case I have three or four Crucifixes before me, of a several make or form, and of a much differing art. All these four figures have but one and the same representation, because they represent but one and the same thing: Christ Jesus our Lord crucified for our reconciliation and redemption: and whatever good affection may arise in my heart upon the sight and thought of it, must needs be the same to that representation and thing represented: because it is terminated upon the thing represented by means of the representation of it. And that is but one and the same respect, though the figures be many. For the representation or figure can terminate no such thought, although it be a means of directing it. But yet all those four figures have respects of their own, which they bound and terminate themselves; by reason, for example, of the excellency of their colours, the material on which they are wrought, the exactness of art in limning every part to the life, and the proportions of the whole in its due and full

full measure. These and such like considerations are ended fully in the picture, without any consideration had to its object represented. And they may be of such concernment in the business, that a man may be moved to prefer one of those four pictures before all the other three. This is that I mean Sir, when I say that a shadow, figure or representation neither does nor can terminate any such respect as results naturally upon the samplar or prototype; though it may its own. And this is no sophistry of Aristotle, but meer natural and vulgar reason, common to all mankind.

*O but the Papists make their pictures their gods.* I, this is the talk of black ministers in the dark, to fools and children; while they sit warm in the Roman Catholik Benefices which they have invaded; it behooves them to say, what ever they can think against Popery, be it right, be it wrong, be it sence or nonsense. All goes down by a people once inveigled. And if they be not still kept warm in their mistake, the minister is lost. Good God, in what a world do we live! I did my self beleev all this once. And I wondered, when I first saw Roman Catholiks to tear their pictures sometime, and put them into the fire. It is no such marvel, if Epiphanius should tear a Saints picture, which your Disswader here tells us, although that story be not found in that epistle of Epiphanius translated by  
St.

St. Jerom, Roman Catholiks do it ordinarily. For they use picturs but as they do their prayer-books, and when they are so sullied and worn they can use them no more, they are turned both into ashes, which is the last end of picturs, books, and men. And the respect they give to pictures, is but the very same kind, with what they give to the holy Gospels, save only that the Gospel is looked on as the inside, and a Crucifix the outside of their Redeemer; but both are still but shadows of him.

I could say more concerning this business, and make it appear both that Christians have ever in all ages had images of their Lord and his Saints in their houses and Churches, and how profitable and useful they are, and that they are neither against the will of God, nor any right reason. And this I could clearly prove out of S. Basil, Eusebius Cæsariensis, S. Gregory Nazianzen and Nyssen, S. Austin, Bede, Jo. Damascen, Athanasius, Ambrose, Chrysostom. But I have here said enough, if I have enough demonstrated, as I think I have, that your Diswader has said nothing.

§. 9. *Which is an appendage to the former.*

“ Reprovs the picturing of God the Father and  
 “ holy Trinity, which many of the holy Fathers  
 “ speak against, much to the blame of the Ro-  
 “ man Church, which in their Mass-books and  
 “ Breviaries, Portuises and Manuals picture the

“holy Trinity with three noses, and four eyes,  
“and three faces in a knot.

Though the Catholik Christian Church hath ever used and approved of the use of Images, as well as spiritual books, yet they allow not of any abuse in either. And Ordinaries, Byshops, Visitours, and Superiours in all places are to look to that. So that in this his appendage, as he calls it, your Disswader acts but the part of a good Visitour, to blame and mend that which is amiss; which must continually be done, and continually is done all over the Catholick world, as well in this, as other affairs. And if any Ordinary be negligent herein, he is worthy of blame. But Sir, this is nothing of Popery or Catholik Religion; which allows only in general the use of pious figures, to forward our thoughts and desires to that eternal felicity above, which so many holy Virgins, Confessours, Martyrs, Apostles, Monks, Hermits, and pious Princes, portrayed all before our eyes, arrived unto, by their austerities, alms-deeds, purity, fastings, disciplines, meditations, watchings, and patient sufferings, in love and conformity to their holy Redeemer, who is the prince, and leader, and crown of all those his glorious Saints, redeemed and sanctified by the vertue of his precious blood and passion, out of the thralldom of Satan and this wicked world. Nor has Catholik Religion ever descended unto  
the



the particular circumstances of these figures. This belongs to the care of Bishops and Ordinaries. Catholiks have generally no figures, but of such only, as once have lived amongst them in their Church, either as head or members of it. Nor of many ages would byshops permit the holy Trinity, especially God the Father to be pourtrayed at all. And if now they suffer it, they have for it I make no doubt a sufficient reason; especially since they heed not at all, however your Disswader imagines, any natural similitude in any of their pictures. If they be so made, as to raise the fanſie to thoughts above, and the love and vertues that may bring us thither, they care not whether, for example, Saint Bennet were a man juſt of that complexion, or Chriſt their Redeemer of thoſe direct features the limner has given him. They come not into their Churches, nor do they caſt their eyes upon their pictures for any ſuch end. And if God the Father be represented to their eyes, as he is to their ears, when he is called *Father*, I ſee no harm in it. If we may uſe ſuch a form of words, when we ſpeak to God, as this world we live in may afford our ears, why may not the eyes have ſuch an answerable form too. But this is a buſineſs, which your Diſſwader, if he were a Catholik, might well propound in the next general Council, and do otherwiſe in the mean time, if ſo he pleaſe in his own Dioceſs.

For neither books nor pictures can be used in any Diocess, but what the Ordinary of the place allows. And the Byshop still guides himself by the general doctrine and discipline, the faith and custom, the tradition and laws of the Church in the whole managment of his care. And when these do not clearly descend to any particular which he is to deal with, he uses therein his own discretion, going that way, if he do well, that he findes comes nearest to the rule, as temporal superiours also do in their affairs.

*O but the Roman Church with much scandal, and against nature and the reason of mankind in their mass-books and breviaries, portuises and manuels picture the holy Trinity with three noses, and four eyes, and three faces in a knot. And do they so? I have seen I think as many Catholik countreys, and mass-books, and breviaries, portuises, and manuels, as your Disswader ever did, and yet I never saw any such picture therein all my life. He has been it seems an earnest pryer into the front and faces of books. But did he not mistake, trow you? and take some fortune-book, written in old letters, for a mass-book? and thence conclude, that all breviaries and mass-books, portuises and manuels were stored with such figures. However it were, the picture was to blame. For three noses and three faces ought to have more than four eyes. And if there were but four eyes, I cannot see how there should*

should be three whole faces, although ther were there three noses in it. But this is as good stuff, and as true, and as pertinent too, as any other part of this his book, which he calls a Disswative from Popery.

§. 10. *Which is against Papal authority.*

“ Sayes, that the Popes universal byshoprick  
 “ is another novelty, though not so ridiculous,  
 “ yet as dangerous as any other. And a novelty  
 “ it is; for Christ left his Church in the hands  
 “ of the Apostles, without any superiority of  
 “ one above another. And in the Councel of  
 “ Jerusalem, James and not Peter gave the de-  
 “ cisive sentence. Christ sent all his Apostles  
 “ with the same whole power, as his Father  
 “ sent him. Therfor. S. Paul bid the byshops of  
 “ Miletum feed the whole flock. And well said  
 “ S. Cyprian, that the Apostles were all the same  
 “ that S. Peter was. And this equality of pow-  
 “ er must descend to all byshops, who succeed  
 “ the Apostles in their ordinary power, as em-  
 “ bassadours for Christ. So then by the law of  
 “ Christ one byshop is not superiour to an-  
 “ other. Christ made no head of byshops. Be-  
 “ yond the byshop is no step, till you rest in the  
 “ great shepheard and byshop of souls. Un-  
 “ der him every byshop is supream in spiri-  
 “ tuals, and in all power which to any byshop  
 “ is given by Christ. And that this was ever be-  
 “ lieved in ancient times, is proved by Pope

"Eleutherius his epistle to the byshops of  
 "France, by S. Ambrose, S. Cyprian, Pope  
 "Symmachus, S. Denyse, Ignace, Gelafius, Je-  
 "rom, Fulgentius, and even Pope Gregory the  
 "great. Wherfor S. Paul expressly sayes, that  
 "Christ appointed in his Church first Apostles,  
 "but not S. Peter first. Nor did Peter ever  
 "rule but by common counsel, as S. Chryso-  
 "stom witnesses. And it is even confest by  
 "som of the Romish party, that the succession  
 "is not tyed to Rome, as Cusanus, Soto, Dri-  
 "edo, Canus and Segovius. Nor was any thing  
 "known therof in the primitive times, when  
 "the byshops of Asia and Africa opposed Pope  
 "Victor and Pope Stephen; and all byshops  
 "treated with the Roman byshop as with a  
 "brother not superiour, and a whole general  
 "Council gave to the byshop of C. P. equal  
 "right and preheminence with the byshop of  
 "Rome. Finally, Christ gave no command-  
 "ment to obey the byshop of Rome, and pro-  
 "bably never intended any such thing.

A man would surely think Sir, that this nail  
 is knocked in to the head. What could be said  
 more? But to be brief with you. If all the  
 other sections of this your Disswasive have said  
 nothing, this I may say speaks something wors  
 than nothing. For his reasons are senceles; his  
 testimonies either impertinent or manifestly  
 against himself; and his whole discours con-  
 trary

trary to the laws and constitutions of our English Protestant Church.

To begin with the last: whether you look upon the statutes and acts of Parliament, whereby our English Church and government were first settled in England upon the reformation in the dayes of Edward the sixth, and afterwards ratified: or the articles, canons, and constitutions that were agreed upon by the byshops and clergy, and confirmed both by King Edward, Queen Elizabeth, King James, and our good King Charles, we shall clearly see, that our English Protestant Church and government is Monarchical; and that byshops are as much subjected to their Arch-bishops, as Ministers to Byshops; and Arch-bishops in like manner to the King, in whom the Episcopal power is radical and inherent, and in whom is the fulness of ecclesiastical authority, and from whom byshops do receiv their place, authority, power, and jurisdiction. And that Parson, Vicar, or other Doctour, who shall write or speak contrary to this; by the constitutions and canons ecclesiastical made in the time of our late good King Charles, he is to be suspended; and by the Canons and constitutions ecclesiastical made and confirmed in the Reign of King James, he is excommunicated *ipso facto*; and by the laws of Queen Elizabeth and King Edward to be further punished. How comes it then that

this your dissuading Doctour utterly dissolves all this frame of government, under pretence of talking against papal power, as contrary to the mind and will of Christ; which will and mind is notwithstanding most resolutely asserted by the constitutions and laws of this our very English Church and Kingdom, which rejected indeed the Roman seat and person, but retained still the power and ordination of Church-government; which finally rested, now no longer in any Roman byshop, but in our own princely monarch. If any will but take the pains to look upon our constitutions and statutes he will soon find all this to be most true. This your Disswader in despite of all our laws to the contrary, will have the government of Christs Church not to be monarchical; but a pure aristocracy, ruled by a company of byshops, standing like a company of trees, all in a row, one by another, but no one between the other and heaven. An order he admits or precedency, according as I suppose as one begins to count or number them, but no jurisdiction, no power, no authority, no superiority of any one over the rest. *One byshop, sayes he, is not superiour to another, Christ made no head of byshops. Beyond the byshop is no step, till you rest in the great shepherd and byshop of souls. Under him every byshop is supream in spirituals, and in all power which to any byshop is given by Christ.* But the laws of the

the land and constitutions of our English Protestant Church, teach us on the contrary, that one byshop is superiour to another, and he therfor called an Arch-byshop; and that according to Christ ther is a head both of Byshops and and Arch-byshops: so that ther is one other step yet, before you rest in the great shepherd and byshop of souls, even he who is under Christ supream head and governour of his Church in these his Majesties realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and that, under Christ every byshop is not supream in spirituals, or in all power; mark, I say he is not supream in all power, which to any byshop is given by Christ.

The statutes and acts of Parliament are in every mans hands to look into. But the canons and ecclesiastical constitutions, becaus they are not so obvious, I shall name one or two of them, to justifie this my speech. In our canonical law made in Kings Edwards dayes, ther is an act tit. 189. *De officio & jurisdictione omnium judicum*, which speaks thus. *Si Episcopus fuerit negligens in administrandâ justitiâ, pertinet ad ejus Archiepiscopum, ipsum compellere ad jus dicendum; illique terminum praescribet, quem si non observaverit absq; legitimo impedimento, non modo censuris ecclesiasticis puniet, verum & in estimationem justam litis damnabit.* It is manifest by this canon, that every byshop is not supream; but that one is superiour and head over the other;



other; so far, as to compel and punish him: which cannot justly be done, without authority and power. Ther is another canon or law yet more full than this, tit. 92. *De ecclesia & ministris ejus*, which speaks thus. *Omnia quæ de Episcopis constituta sunt, ad se pertinere Archiepiscopi quoque agnoscant. Et præter illa, munus illorum est, in sua provinciâ episcopos collocare, cum à nobis, saith the King, electi fuerint. Utque totius provinciæ suæ statum melius intelligat Archiepiscopus, semel provinciam suam universam si possit ambibit & visitabit. Et quoties contigerit aliquas vacare sedes episcopales, episcoporum locos, non modo in visitatione, sed etiam in beneficiorum collocatione, & omnibus aliis functionibus ecclesiasticis implebit. Quin & ubi episcopi sunt, si eos animadvertat in suis muneribus curandis & præsertim in corrigendis vitiis tardiores & negligentiores esse, quàm in gregis Domini præfectis ferri possit, primum illos paterne monebit. Quod si monitione non profuerit, illi jus esto alios in eorum loco collocare. Appellantium etiam ad se querelas causasque judicabit. Episcopi suæ provinciæ si qua de re inter se contenderint aut litigarint, judex & finitor inter eos esto Archiepiscopus. Ad hæc audiet & judicabit accusationes contra episcopos suæ provinciæ. Ac denique, si ulla contentiones aut lites inter episcopum & archiepiscopum orta fuerint, nostro judicio, saith the King, who ratifies these ecclesiastical canons, and puts them forth in his own name, cognoscentur & defini-*

*finientur. Archiepiscopi quoq; munus esto synodos provinciales nostro jussu convocare.* By this constitution or canon, one of those canons on which our very English Protestant Church is founded, it manifestly appears, that an Arch-bishop, or in plain English a prime bishop or chief bishop is not a name only of order or decent precedency, as your Disswader here speaks, but of dignity, authority, power, superiority, and jurisdiction over bishops. And he is as much above them, as other ordinary bishops are above a Presbyter or parochial minister. For in administering Sacraments, and preaching Gods word, every minister is impowred as fully as any bishop: but the government of ministers or presbyters within the Diocess, is proper only to one, who therfor has the name and title of bishop, which signifies an Overseer of the rest. This bishop admits of presbyters into a parish, and when any parish is vacant, he sees that one be put in: if any be careles and negligent in the duty of his parish, he first advises him like a father, and if he will not amend his manners, he puts him out, and furnishes the place with a better pastour: he judges the complaints between parishioners and parsons, or between parsons or presbyters among themselves, and decides them: he visits and keeps chapter, or should do at least, and finds and speaks, and punishes their faults. All these things

things are contained in the office of a byshop; which therfor argue him to have an authority, power, or jurisdiction over other Presbyters or pastours within his Dioces: although he be a presbyter or pastour himself; and a chief one too, that is to say, with a more ample and large authority, then any one of those who be under him hath given them, and therfor called a byshop or overseer by way of eminence. And if all these things do, as needs they must, argue not only an order or bare precedency, but a jurisdiction and power of a byshop over other presbyters; then must they needs conclude the same power to be in one byshop over another, in him namely, who by way of eminency is called *the byshop* or *archbyshop*, or *prime byshop* amongst the rest; who is as truly the byshop of byshops, as these are overseers of presbyters. For this prime byshop is declared by the abovesaid canon, to be enabled by vertue of his office, to have all the power and charge that other byshops have; and then over and above that, first to place the byshops elect, and seat them each one in their provinces; then to go over and visit the whole province authoritatively, which none of the byshops under him can do: thirdly to see vacant seats supplied: fourthly, if such byshops as he shall find slow and negligent in their duty, after a fatherly admonishment, mend not, to put others in their place:

place: fifthly, to judg the complaints and causes of such as appeal unto him from their own byshops: sixthly, to decide the controversies that may happen between one byshop and another: seventhly, to judg the accusations that are against any byshop: lastly, to call synods, and there conclude and decide what may seem best for the welfare and spiritual government of his province. Are these the works of authority, power, and jurisdiction, yea or no? If they be not, how can any authority or power be proved? For all power is proved by its act; or how in particular may it appear, that byshops have any authority over their presbyters or ministers? But if they be; then is ther more than a *precedency or order amongst byshops*: then did not *Christ leav his Church in the hands of the Apostles without any superiority of one above another*, as this Disswader talks: For the laws and constitutions of this our Church and Kingdom, do publicly attest that this our English Church is settled according to the will of Christ, by archbishops and byshops, which is absolutely true; then also did not *Christ send all his apostles with the same whole power*; then were not *all the apostles the same that Peter was*; then did not an equality of power descend from the apostles to all byshops; then is there a step beyond the ordinary byshop, nay two steps, before you come to rest in the great shepherd and byshop of souls; then, under

Christ

Christ is not every byshop supream in spirituals, nor yet in all the power which to any byshop is given by Christ; all this I say is true, whatsoever your Disswader talks against not only the Catholik Church and government, which was here for above a thousand years together in England, but against the very frame and constitution of his own Protestant Church, wherof he is himself an unworthy member. But ministers when they begin to talk against popery, they are so heedlessly earnest, that they knock out their own brains; and either to get a benefice or honour in it, they destroy their own Church that gives it them. I can no more wonder now, that such an one as Whitby, in his book written against worthy Cressly, should say so peremptorily, that *an archbysshop hath no power or authority, and that his grace of Canterbury hath no jurisdiction*, as he there talks, *impar congressus Achilli*; since a man of such renown, as Doctor Taylor, should speak the same here, and give the Presbyterians and other Sectaries in the Land, such a fair occasion and president to undermine and overthrow that Church, which is but lately lift out of the ruins of their hands. The same argument, that proves the byshop, an ordinary byshop to be under none but immediately under Christ, will prove as much for a single Presbyter or Presbyterian. And it is already done by the subtle pen of John Bastwick, in his *Apologisticus*

*geticus ad praesules Anglicanos*, which book is so strongly written both against Popish and Protestant Prelacy too, that upon the grounds on which all Protestants go, it can never be answered; and upon the grounds Doctor Taylor here layes, it is all of it in a manner confirmed and made good. What a strange madness is it for any one, that he may seem to weaken another Church, to overthrow his own. Truth is, here is no tye in England, that any one will be held with. The scriptur is in every mans bosom to make what he will of it. Ancient canons, customs and counsels they slight as erroneous. Their own constitutions and statutes they do not so much as heed. What can be expected from hence but eternal dissention and wars.

Nay the minister to get his orders and benefice, the bishop to enter into his See, make a solemn protestation of obedience and subjection. When they have got their ends, they wipe their mouths, and so far forget what they have done, that they write and act presently, as if they had never thought any such thing. See here the form of consecration of byshops prescribed and used by our English Protestant Church. In the name of God. Amen. I N. chosen byshop of the Church or See of N. do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the archbyshop and to the Metropolitan Church of N. and to their successors.

*So help me God through Jesus Christ.* Where reverence, subjection and obedience is due on one side, there must needs be authority, power and jurisdiction on the other. And that man, who hath One set over him with such an authority under Christ, cannot be immediately under Christ himself; and if he affirm he is so, then *ipso facto* doth he reject and rebel against that authority which in words he acknowledged. This is Dr. Taylors case, who teaches here, that *byshops are successours of the Apostles*; and that *ther was no superiority amongst the Apostles*; that *by the law of Christ one byshop is not superiour to another*; that *Christ made no head of byshops*; that *beyond the byshop is no step, till you rest in the great shepherd and byshop of souls, &c.* What is this, but to reject all obedience and loyalty, solemnly vowed and promised? and to rebell against all the laws and constitutions of his own Church; and finally, which is wors than all the rest, to give an example to disaffected ministers of doing the like?

But how does he prove all this? very copiously both by reasons of his own, and authorities of other men. Only the mishap is, those signifie nothing at all for him; these, very much against him. But what are his reasons? *Byshops are the Apostles successours, and ther was no superiority amongst the Apostles.* Mr. Bastwick and such as he will tell you, Sir, that *priest, minister,*  
and



and *byshop* were but several synonimous words for one and the same thing upon diuers respects: so that it is to be feared your *Disswader* hath proved too much here, and hath spoken against himself; but if he hath not proved too much, he hath proved nothing. I am sure there was a superiority amongst the Apostles, and shall demonstrate it by and by, as well as I can. In the mean time, how prove you ther was none? *Christ sent all his apostles with the same whole power, his father sent him.* Good Sir, our Lord sayes indeed, *as my father sent me, so do I send you*; giving them a legal commission from him, as himself had from God his eternal Father. But that he sent them every one with the same *whole power*, that is, so to teach and govern, that they should be subject to no one amongst them, these are your *Disswaders* words, cast in by fraud and fallacy, and no authority evangelical; and therfor prove nothing. Nay if Christ had so sent his Apostles, every one with the whole power of governing in himself, then had he changed his fathers commission. For he was sent himself to be one head and governour; and yet he had then constituted many. But how can you dream, good Doctour, that Christ sent his apostles, each one with all his whole power he had received from God, since the very chiefest of his power, which is to confer grace upon the ministerial acts of his words and sacraments, cannot be given to man.

You see how fondly as well as falsely you have foisted in these words, *with all his whole power*. What follows next. *S. Paul bid the byshops of Miletum feed the whole flock*. Pray Sir how many byshops were ther, do you think, in that one, no huge town of Miletum. Bastwick brings this for a proof, that byshops and priests were all one thing in those dayes. And if it be otherwise, the times are much changed. Then many byshops served one town; now many towns will hardly serve one byshop. But you cut off the sentence Sir; that it may sound better for your purpos, and, which is wors, change it too. The Apostle charges them to *attend to themselves and all the flock, wherein the holy Ghost hath constituted them overseers*. Which last words becaus they limit both their care and your own argument, you thought it prudence to leav them out. Pray Sir, would you have any byshop to enter upon anothers Diocess? What then would you have here, when you make *S. Paul bid the pastors all of them to feed all the whole flock, without any restriction*? In all your heats remember still your self. Go on. *The equality of power must descend to all byshops, who are their successors*. I can easily grant you, that they have all of them equal power of administering Sacraments, and looking to their flock, every one within his own precincts. And this is all your discours infers. But an equality of power over one another, was neither amongst the  
Apo

Apostles ; nor yet here in our English byshops, nor ever in the Church of God. How do you prove that ? *By the law of Christ one byshop is not superiour to another ; Christ made no head of byshops : beyond the byshop is no step till you rest in the great shepheard and byshop of souls. Under him every byshop is supream.* This argument is in a mood and figure called *Ita dico*. You say so : and the statutes and canons of the Church of England say no. Whom shall we beleev ? I alwayes prefer a Church before any one Churchman, though he be in her, when he is against her. But *S. Paul sayes expresly, that Christ appointed in his Church first apostles, but not S. Peter first.* I marry Sir ! now we are come to an argument indeed. And it runs thus, *According to S. Paul, the apostles were the first rank or dignity in the Church : but S. Peter was none of that rank or dignity ; therfor he could not be first.* Was not S. Peter then one of the apostles ? or will you make it run thus ? *The apostles were the first rank or dignity in the Church, but S. Peter was not that rank or dignity, therfor he was not first.* This is indeed the surer way. Becaus no one man can be reckoned for a rank or dignity, or so many persons in the plural number. This is an argument never yet thought of in Oxford or Cambridg, to prove they have no superiour either over all, or over any one Colledge. Not over all : For ther be first Colledges, then

Halls, then Inns, &c. therfor the Vice-Chancellor is not first. Not over one Colledge: For ther are first Fellows, then Schollars, then Pensioners, &c. and therfor Mr. *such a one* who is neither fellows, schollars, nor pensioners is not first. So here, *Christ*, saith S. Paul, *set in his Church first of all apostles*, therfor saith our learned Doctour, *not first S. Peter, and secondarily apostles, but all the apostles were first*. The apostles were the first rank of dignity, good Sir, but that rank had order in it too. And so ther might be place for a first man, even in the first rank. But *Peter did never rule but by common councel*, as S. Chrysostome witnesses. He ruled then good Sir, it seems he ruled then. Will you bring this for an argument of his not ruling? You are shrewdly put to it in the mean time. And if he ruled and governed and mannaged all by common councel, he was the better superiour for that; but not therfor no superiour. Will you admit no rulers but tyrants, who do all by their own will. But *even some of their own popish writers do grant, that the succession is not tied to Rome, as Cusanus, Soto, Canus, Driedo, Segovius*. What does that opinion of theirs, if they did say so, prove against the sovereignty of one byshop over the rest, which is the only thing now in hand, wherever he reside? I cannot in reason be thought to speak against our English monarchy, although I should haply say,  
that

that the King is not bound to reside still at Westminster. The papal pastour hath ever since S. Peters time, ever resided yet in that Roman Diocess, which Catholiks do indeed consider as a thing somewhat strange; since all other apostolical Sees besides that, are failed and gone; but no man knows the disposition of divine providence here on earth for future times. Perhaps that Roman See, I mean the particular Roman Diocess shall so remain to the worlds end; and perhaps again it may not. And if it should not, or if that whole City should be destroyed, or Christian Religion in it; or if the City and all the whole Kingdom of Italy should lye under the ocean, quite overwhelmed and drowned, yet so long as the world lasts, ther shall be a Church of Christ on earth; and so long as ther is a Church, ther will be one supreme pastour of it, where ever he reside. And this is that which som Catholik doctours mean, when they say that the succession is not tied to Rome. What doth this make to your purpos Mr. Disswader? Go on then. *No papal sovereignty was thought of in primitive times, when the byshops of Asia and Africa opposed Pope Victor and Pope Stephen.* Does an opposition infer a nullity of power? Then Sir ther would be no power upon earth either ecclesiastical or civil; which are all resisted one time or other. Was there no royalty or byshops in England so much

as thought of thirty years ago, when they were both of them more than opposed by the rabble? What miserable shifts are these! You may find, and I am confident you do find, and know well enough, that even in those times you speak of, and before and after them, the papal power was acknowledged and revered by the whole world: and yet you will take advantage of a dispute, that happens more or less in all ages, to say against your conscience, and from thence infer, that the papal power was not so much as thought of in those primitive times. God keep you Sir from contesting with any of your servants. For if you do, this argument of yours will prove, that your authority in your own house was not so much as thought of in those dayes, either by you, or them, or any els. Have you any thing els to say? *A general Council of Chalcedon gave to the byshop of C. P. equal rights and preheminence with the byshop of Rome.* What general Council was that? and who is that C. P. and what were those equal rights universal over all, or by way of similitude over some? A Constable may have given him equal rights and preheminence in his lesser charge unto some purposes, as a King hath in his whole Kingdom; what then? If this prove any thing, it is, that there is a sovereign power over all, in proportion to which, is measured out the right and authority of another in order to one particular.

But

But all byshopps ever treated with the Roman Byshop as with a brother, not as a superiour. As brother and superiour too, he both treated with them and they with him, as I could easily show at large. But to a bare fals affirmation one single negation will suffice. *Christ gave no command to obey the byshop of Rome, and probably never intended any such thing.* He commanded and probably intended, that all should obey those that were set over them. Is not that enough? I pray you Sir tell me, did he give any command to obey the byshop of Canterbury here in England, or the byshop of Armagh in Ireland, or probably ever intend any such thing? Speak out. If he did, the Roman Prelate will challenge obeysance upon the same title: if he did not, then is your promise and vow in episcopal ordination insignificant and fond. But *James and not Peter gave the decisive sentence in the Councel at Jerusalem.* And why say you so? How prove you that his words and not the other were decisive, when one of them did but second the other.

Now since your Disswader hath proved after his manner, that ther is not any one sovereign byshop over all, pray give me leav Sir to let you know, why I think on the contrary, that one such there is and ought to be. And to omit testimonies, which are in this point innumerable, I shall for brevities sake only use two reasons.



The first is: That Christ our Lord would have the whole company of Christians upon earth ever to be and remain one flock. This I conceive can never be, except they be all under one visible pastour. Nor can it suffice to say here, that they are all under one Christ and one God: For this can never make them all, either really to be, or truly to be called one flock on earth. All the Kingdoms and people in the world, however they be governed, are under one God the supreme King, as the whole Church is said to be under one Christ: but this makes them not to be one Kingdom. Nay, those that have not a visible King, are not any Kingdom at all; but an aristocracy only, or commonwealth, or wild straglers. But if you will have no visible flock of Christians upon earth, you teach the Quakers doctrine, and abolish all government. It is certain then, that if the ecclesiastical government of each place, do end in the bishop of that respective Diocese, as the Disswader talks, that there must be then as many flocks of Christians, as there be bishops upon earth; which being not subordinate all of them to one general pastour, can never bring their flocks into one.

Second is, That such a polity and government must ever be preserved in Christs Church, which himself set up and practised. This is most certain. For if that polity or body be changed, it  
is

is no more Christs polity or Christs body, but that other, whatever it be which is introduced in his place, and the body of that man or men that introduced it: from whence also it receiv's its name; as from Luther, his followers are called Lutherans, and Calvinists from Calvin: and consequently all the laws, which do ever follow the condition of the government, must alter with it. Thus it was with us here in England the other day. When our government was changed, we were no more the body of William the Conquerour, or any polity instituted by him; but another polity or body, set up by the Rump-Parliament; and all our laws became then liable to their arbitrary interpretation, to be wrested as themselves pleased. And they had been, if we had continued a while longer in that sad condition, by degrees utterly abolished. All this not our reason only, but heavy experience will acknowledg for a certain truth. But Christ our Lord did assuredly both set up and practise himself a visible sovereignty over all the whole flock of Christians, which he gathered together from other visible companies of Jews and Pagans. And therfor must ther still and ever be, som one visible pastour over this one flock unto the worlds end. For if that polity or body change, then is it no more Christs body, but another thing. And his laws and religion will be then interpreted according

to the pleasure of those who first rejected the government, and of their followers afterward, unto infinite and endless misery.

And that this polity or government is ever to remain in Christs Church on earth, may be gathered, first by this ; That every wise legislator knows well enough, that all his people under him look upon his example, as their rule to steer by ever after, so long as they mean to preserv his way, and be of his body. Thus, when any state is once founded either in aristocracy, democracy or monarchy, the founder of such a state has no need to tell the people, what he would have them to do afterwards ; or whether they should choos themselves one governour or many ; where they have his clear example to walk by. They will naturally follow his steps therin, so long as they mean to preserv the state he has established. Now the Apostles and all his disciples and beleivers knew and saw, that the Church of Christ, which is his state spiritual, was founded by him in monarchy, or the superintendency of one over all. And therfor as soon as our Lord spoke to them of his own departure, they began all of them naturally to think of one, who should succeed in his general care, and who that one should be. Nor did they doubt, whether one should be over all the flock, but who should be that one, that should preside and oversee it. And to prevent the faction, our  
Lord,

Lord, as Catholik tradition teaches, and the letter of the Gospel not obscurely insinuates, pointed out one; giving him withall a good rule of humility and charity to remain for after ages, *That he that is greatest among them should be as the least*, most humble, most serviceable, most full of observance and charity: which rule if that chief pastour observ not, he is the more to blame. And all ages have ever looked upon the successour of that chief apostle, as Vicegerent of our Lord and master; under whom they are united in one flock, and so keep their laws and religion still one, and intirely the the same, from age to age; however they lye divided in place and time under several byshops up and down the world. Whereas all others besides this one Catholik flock, run into several bodies; and by their various interpretations, dissolv by little and little, according as themselves increas, all the whole frame of ancient religion. Secondly, it may be gathered by this, that Christ our Lord instituted a monarchical government of his Church, ruled so long as he lived by one, and therfor must that government ever remain. He set it up to remain. For surely he did not set it up to be pulled down again. Thirdly, becaus there is no power on earth to change it. What God has constituted, man cannot undo, lawfully I mean he cannot.

Now

Now we have no such body of Christians in England, that remain under one who is general pastour over all the Christian flock in the world, or do so much as pretend it, save only the few Roman Catholiks, that are yet here left alive, by the strange providence of that God, unto whose universal Church they have still adhered, notwithstanding the greatest trials that ever poor Christians were put to. Neither Quaker, Anabaptist, or Independent, Presbyterian or Prelate-Protestant do so much as pretend to any such thing; but they all oppose it. And as they do not pretend to belong to any general body, that hath a visible head overseeing the whole flock of Christ throughout the world; so neither is any of their Church-governments monarchical in their respective place, if we may beleev themselves. I know our English Protestant Church was first appointed in the dayes of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth to be respectively monarchical, that is to say, within the precincts of this Kingdom, the hierarchy ending in the Kings majesty, who is doubtles the supream head and governour both of the Protestant Church and the temporal or civil state, in all these his three Kingdoms. But indeed and truth none of them acknowledg it. For they do not, any of them, expect, as they ought all of them to do, a full decisive sentence from the Kings Majesties lips  
in

in all their contröversies or doubts of faith ; nor will they acquiesce in his judgment : which is a strange mad refractorines in our nation, and contrary to our own principles. The Independents last tribunal is in the light of his own breast. The Presbyterian will not look beyond his Presbyteral Consistory. And the Prelate-Protestant writer, which I most marvel at; ends all in the byshops, allowing no authority, power or jurisdiction to their Archbishops, but only an order and decent precedency for manners sake, which in effect is wholly to dissolve the constituted frame of Church-government in this land. They speak not indeed of the Kings majesty, for fear I suppose of the rod God hath put into his hands. But it is not hard to gather both by their words and actions, what they think. Whitby of late wrote a book against Dean Cressy, and there he sayes expesly, that an Arch-bishop hath a decent precedency, but no authority; and that his Grace of Canterbury hath no jurisdiction; and that the Kings Majesty is not the root of Episcopal jurisdiction here in England: And yet he was approved and praised even by our Protestant byshops. Do they not see, that *à pari*, nay *à fortiori* the same be affirmed of our byshops? that they have no authority, and that they have but a decent precedency over Presbyters, and that they are not the root of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. With what a  
strange

strange blindnes are our eyes possest ! Nay, this great Disswader an eminent man among Prelate-Protestants; here teaches publicly, *that byshops are all supream under Christ*. So that this our Church-government by byshops, can be no other but Aristocracy; the Presbyterians a Democracy; and the rest a plain Anarchy, every man thinking and acting what is good in his own eyes. And none of these, who are all fallen from the general flock and general pastour, heed unto effect, any one thing that may restrain them, either statutes, canons, laws, constitutions, or ought els. But God blesses his true Church with a true obedience. Thus I have given you Sir my reason, why I think ther is and must be one general pastour over all the whole flock of Christians. Pray ponder it well. Brief I am in it, becaus it is beyond my general design, which is only to shew, that Doctour Taylors Disswative from Popery is insignificant.

I am now come to the testimonies your Disswader cites for himself; which I told you before, are above half of them impertinent, and the rest, if he had not fraudulently maimed them, flatly against himself. As for the first sort, your Disswader imagining in his head, that the Apostles had no superiour, which is the grand falsity on which all his whole discours runs, brings all those authors who either say,  
that



that *byshops* are the *successours* of the *Apostles*; or that they had received the *keyes* of *heaven*; or that they are not to be contemned, and the like, for witnesses of his opinion, as *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Anacletus*, *Clemens*, *Hieronimus*, *Gregorius*, and various others. All this is impertinent. But the other authorities, had they not been curtaild and perverted by him, had openly and plainly spoken that *Catholik* truth, which he here opposes; namely that the *Apostles* had a *superiour*; and that all the whole *Christian* flock have and ought to have one general *pastour*, and that he ever hitherto hath sate since *S. Peters* death in the *Roman See*. I know it would be worth my labour to set down all those testimonies by him here cited, at large as they lye in those *Catholik* Fathers and *Divines*: as apt at one and the same time to convince this his whole section of falsity, and the *Catholik* doctrine to be no novelty, as he sayes it is. But because this is already done by the above-named *Catholik* Gentlemen, who with a greater patience than I am master of, turned over those many ancient authours, I will content my self with only the first of them.

*In the whole new testament*, saith your *Disswader*, there is no act or sign of *superiority*; or that one *apostle* exercised power over another: but to them whom *Christ* sent, he in common intrusted the *Church* of *God*, according to that excellent saying

ing of S. Cyprian, the other apostles are the same that S. Peter was, indowed with an equal fellowship of honour and power, &c.

This then is the excellent saying of S. Cyprian, *The other apostles are the same that St. Peter was, indowed with an equal fellowship of honour and power.* And he cites it out of his epistle de unit. Ecclesia ad Novatian. But did S. Cyprian either say or mean by that saying, so much of it as is S. Cyprians, that ther was no superiority among the apostles, or that the Church of God was intrusted to them in common? Nay, does not S. Cyprian use those words in a discours wherein he endeavours industriously to declare, that there was a superiority among the Apostles; in which as in a cone of unity they were all united, although they were all alike in power and commission of administering Sacraments. If it be so, what shall we think of this Disswader, and of his excellent saying of S. Cyprian, to prove that the Church was intrusted to the apostles in common; and that no one apostle exercised a power over another. The text of S. Cyprian runs thus. *Our Lord said to Peter, Upon this rock will I build my Church, and again feed thou my sheep. Upon the one Him Christ builds his Church, and unto Him he commends his sheep to be fed. And although after his resurrection he gave to all his apostles equal power, and said, as my father sent me, so I send you; yet that he might manifest unity,*

he

he constituted one chair, and by his authority disposed the origen of unity beginning from one. The other apostles are the same that Peter was, &c. But the beginning comes from unity, the primacy is given to Peter, that one Church of Christ and one flock of Christ may be monstrated. Thus St. Cyprian testifies of the apostles, that although they were all equal in their spiritual commission of Gods word and Sacraments, yet were they brought to an unity by the government of one superiour, and one chair which oversaw them all. And is this a fit place to prove, that the Apostles had no superiour over them, which expressly testifies that they had one? In the same manner doth our Disswader deal with the other testimonies. But I have been too long upon this point. Here is enough Sir to let you see, what I said in the beginning of this discours, that your Disswaders reasons are senceles; his testimonies either impertinent or manifestly against himself; and his whole talk and doctrine contrary to the laws and constitutions of our own Protestant English Church.

— § 11. Which concludes the novelties.

“ Gives notice of nine other popish novelties, Saints invocation, Scripture-insufficiency, absolution before pennance, Priests confirmation, nine-penny-masses, circumgestation of Eucharist, intention in Sacraments, mass-sacrifice, and communionless mass.

A a

After

After your Disswader has mentioned these to show the fertility of his brain, he sayes nothing of them at all, but only that *they be also innovations*; and thence concluds, that the Roman Religion is neither *old nor primitive nor catholik*, and that it is *easier for Protestants to tell where their religion was before Luther, then for Papists to tell where their religion was before Trent*. And that when the enemy had sowed these tares, and honest men in the Church durst not complain, then England and other nations by the glass of *Scriptur* reformed to pure antiquity, preferring a new cure before an old sore. In the beginning of the section it was a new sore, in the end it is an old sore, so long time was he a writing this one no-section. And he has so ordered the business, that it will be hard now for Papists to show their Religion before Trent, although he has neither deduced the original of these nine or his other ten novelties from Trent, nor can ever show that these or they are the Papists religion. For as he has handled them, ther is not one of them any part of their Religion; much less doth their religion consist in them. His first business of the power of making articles (sect. 1.) is so far from religion, that it is not so much as the philosophy of any one school in the Catholik world. His leash of new articles, (sect. 2.) is partly a fond dream, and partly an erroneous vision of his own. His discours of  
Indul.

Indulgences (sect. 3.) is utterly besides the purpose; and what ther is of Catholik faith in it, he allows himself as ancient. 4. His talk of Purgatory is so ridiculously absurd, that granting all that Roman faith reaches, to be both ancient and universal; he yet sayes at random, that Roman faith is not that, and yet never speaks himself what that Roman faith is. 5. In Transubstantiation he wholly playes with the word, which he knows when it came in, wholly neglecting the thing it self; and brings a multitude of Popish Doctours that own it not for their faith, and not any one popish man or woman that own it: he sayes it was defined in the Lateran Councel first; and yet is not that which was defined in the Lateran Councel, and never speaks what this thing is, which notwithstanding he will have called Popery. 6. The busines of half-communion, as he calls it, is no Popery at all, that is to say, no Catholik faith, but a custom only in the exercise of their religion, and that neither universal for time or place. And although Catholiks beleev, that it is not necessary to communicate in both kinds, yet do they not beleev, that it is necessary to communicate only in one kind, either this kind or that; but have used all the three wayes. 7. His discours about service in an unknown tongue is a like mistake, taking custom for religion, and discipline for doctrine; and he perverts and

falsifies the custom too, saying that Papists understand not their own prayers, nor know what they ask of God. 8. His talk of images passes by all the use of them that religion requires, and is wholly taken up in some school disputes and his own lies. 9. His exceptions against the pictures of the Trinity with so many eyes and noses and faces in a knot, is as much popery as *Euclids* book *de Triangulis*. 10. His section about the sovereignty of one byshop over all Christians had been about popery and catholik religion indeed, if he had handled it right; but as his reasons are fond, and authorities fals; so he mistakes the very thing it self, imagining that papists beleev that spiritual supremacy to be tied to the walls of Rome, which is no faith of theirs, and consequently none of their popery. And so none of his sections, nor any part of his discours touches either all or any part of Papists religion. And is not this a doughty piece of work to prove popery, by which all his readers understand the Roman Catholik religion, to be neither old, nor primitive, nor apostolical? How he would have handled the other nine points, becaus he says nothing of them, I will not trouble my self to read. But I am sure that seven of the nine have not any relation to Catholik religion; all of them I mean besides *Saints invocation* and the *Sacrifice of the Mass*. What Council hath determined, or what Catholik beleevs, that  
the

the sacred scripture is insufficient ; or that absolution ought to be given before penance ; or that single priests are to confirm ; or that masses are to be sold for nine pence ; or circumgesation ; or any such intention in sacraments as to damn folks , which the Disswader here speaks ; or that mass is to be without communion. And I may now think, if he had spoke of the other two, *Saints invocation* and *Sacrifice* , he would even there also have mistaken and strayed. For he has so behaved himself hitherto, as though he were resolved not to speak any one word true or to the purpos. And yet he would seem to do it, perhaps on the same motive, that Sir *Toby Matthews* flitted from the richer byshoprick of Durham, to that of York, *becaus*, as he himself gave the reason, *he wanted Grace*. But Doctor *Taylor* must remember his own doctrin , that an Archbyshop, although he have *Grace*, yet he has no *jurisdiction* with it : and it is a question whether is better, to have power without grace, or grace without power. He is well enough as he is, if he could be content. But ambition and covetousnes will know no bounds.

And as your Doctor in this his Disswasive prattles about a Popery which is no part of Catholik religion ; so does he wholly pass by their chief religion, which is in a manner their whole popery ; and all their religious customs attending it ; not that only which the first reformers



allowed of; as their faith of one God, all powerful, most wise and good, who made all things visible and invisible, and by his providence conserves them in their being, who in the fulness of time sent his beloved son to reconcile the world to himself, &c. but that also which they rejected and principally inveighed against: as first internal sanctification and renovation of our spirits; which was the end of Christs appearing in the world, the efficacy of his grace in our hearts, and the intention of his counsels and laws: secondly, the comfort, merit and necessity of good works; unto which holy gospel by all sweet promises invites us, Gods holy spirit moves, the very excellency of mans nature and condition suggests, the name and profession of Christian calls for, and future happiness requires. These by the first Protestants were all cried down as mortal sins, and of no value at all in the eyes of God; by which doctrines they debauched mankind, and made men so dissolute, careless and licentious, that if good nature, right reason, and the gracious working of God in our hearts had not more force upon some, than the principles of the first Protestancy, earth had become a meer hell by this. Thirdly, he passes by the priesthood, altar and sacrifice, which Christ our Lord instituted for our daily atonement in the figuration of his holy passion; at which old Christians with all fear and reverence offered up  
their

their daily praises, requests, and supplications to God, for themselves and allies and whole Church of Christ; for all distressed persons, for kings and princes, and for all men, that we may lead a quiet and godly life, in this world. Fourthly, the seven sacraments of Christs; which are so many conduits of sanctification for our several necessities, and for all conditions of men, and for all degrees of spiritual comforts. Fifthly, the obligations of vows, which any shall freely make for Gods glory and his own advancement, in piety, in continency, in charity; and the blessed condition of singing and praising God in monastical retirement. Sixthly, the communion and union of the whole body of Christians under one visible pastor; by whom they are aptly knit and compaginated together into one flock and body of Christ; however they may differ otherwise in cuntry, language, laws, civil government, and other affections. Sevently, the marks of the true Church, and the authority she hath to keep her people in unity of faith and observance of their Christian duties. Eightly, the danger of original sin and actual transgressions; which, however we may have heard of Christian faith, and beleev it to be true, may notwithstanding exclude us eternally from the blis of heaven now opened to beleevers, such, as by mortifying ungodly lusts shall render themselves conformable to their Lord and head, who is ascended

into heaven, and gone before to prepare there a place for them in bliss with himself. Ninthly, the necessary concurrence of Gods grace and mans will unto his justification, and sanctity and future glory in him; *Qui creavit te sine te, non salvabit te sine te*, as good S. Austin speaks. Tenthly, the necessity and great benefit of prayer, alms-deeds and fasting, which is practised in the Catholik Church, and commended to all as worthy fruits of that religion, which labours to root out, pride of life, concupiscence of eyes and concupiscence of flesh thereby: and our obligation to exact justice in all our contracts and dealings with our neighbour. Eleventhly, the danger of living and dying in sin to such as profess Christianity, and uselesnes of faith without the good works of grace attending it. Twelfthly, the possibility of keeping Gods commandments with the assistance of his grace. Lastly, not to mention more, the great duty incumbent upon all Christians, when, led away by the deceit of Satan, flesh and this wicked world they shall chance to have strayed from their holy rule, to set all streight again by humble confession, restitution and other penal satisfactions for their fault. These and such like principles of ancient Christianity, our first reforming Protestants, *Luther* and *Calvin* with other their companions, all apostate priests from the mother Church, so stiffly cryed down as notorious popery, that they have

have thereby corrupted the whole world. But your Doctour in this your Disswative from Popery, for reasons best known to himself, takes no notice of them at all. Protestant writers, however loth to practise them, yet ashamed they are now to speak against good works, as their fore-fathers did. Indeed every one of them that upon the hope of a richer benefice writes against Catholik Religion, makes both a new Popery, and a new Protestancy too; and while they speak in general against that, they may say in particular of this, what they pleas. For Protestants had never any Council to make them all agree, how much of Popery they should reject, or what they should positively establish: nor ever will nor can have; nor do they care, so they keep but their livings and places that they have extorted from Catholik hands, which they know they cannot keep, except by libelling against Popery they get the power of the land, honest and better men then themselves to back and support them in their wayes, whether any thing be ever settled or no.

I should also here set down the substantial customs of Catholik Christians, in their chappels and churches, oratories, and private houses, wholly neglected by the Disswader, though they be in the hearts and hands of them all throughout the whole earth. If he had declared either their substantial faith or customs, he had lost  
his

his credit with some, but he had saved his own soul, which now is becom as black as hell with flanders, lyes, and uncharitable depravations both of their customs and immaculate Religion. What he can pervert and make sport with, that he puts upon them for popery; and what he cannot, that must be thought no popery at all. But this I cannot now insist upon. My letter is already grown too long.

**A**Nd yet I cannot but give you notice Sir, that even these things specified here by your Disswader for popish novelties, as they are rightly understood in the catholik sence and meaning; Indulgences; the real presence, under the apperances or species of material symbols; Communion in one kind, Liturgy in hebrew, greek or latin tongue, unknown generally to vulgar people; Use and respect of images and sacred figures; Spiritual Supremacy in one byshop over the rest; Saints invocation, and sacrifice of mass, are all acknowledged by former Protestant Reformers, for old errors, errors, indeed but old, very old ones, a thousand years older than your Disswader makes them, who would here make us beleev they are but fresh novelties.

As for the antiquity of Indulgences, so far as they belong to Catholik beleef, I need not trouble my self with further testimonies, then  
the

the only one of your Disfunder himself, who is *instar omnium*. For p. 17. he acknowledges their use to be *ancient and primitive*.

As for the real presence, Humpred in his Jesuitism sayes, *that Gregory the great, who lived a thousand years ago, taught Transubstantiation*. The Century writers Cent. 5. teach, that *Chrysostom, who was two hundred years before Gregory, is thought to confirm transubstantiation*: and Cent. 4. they place under the title of *hurtful opinions and errours of the fathers*, that saying of S. Greg. Nyssen in his catechist sermon de divino sacramento, *Not becaus it is eaten doth the bread becom the body of the word, but forthwith by the word it is changed into the body, as it is said by the word, This is my body*. And they say in the same century c. 10. *That Eusebius, Emiffenus did speak unprofitably of Transubstantiation*. Antony de Adamo in his anotomy of the mass sayes, *That the book of Sacraments ascribed to Ambrose affirms the opinion of Christs bodily presence in the sacrament*. Peter Martyr in his defence, wholly dislikes the judgment of St. Cyril in this point. Mr. Whitgift in his defence against Cartwright, testifies of St. Ignatius disciple to St. John the Evangelist, that he should say of some hereticks in his time, *That they do not admit Eucharists and oblations, becaus they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which flesh suffered for our sins*, Adamus Franciscus

in his *margarita theologica*, saith, *Commentum papistarum de transubstantiatione maturè in ecclesiam irrepsit*. And Antony de Adamo in his anatomy of the Mass, saith, *I have not yet hitherto been able to know, when this opinion of the real and bodily being of Christ in the Sacrament did begin*. This then according to the acknowledgment of Protestants and those very learned men, is no novelty.

The indifferency of communion either in one kind or both is manifestly affirmed by Luther in his epistle ad Bohemos, by Melanchton in his century of theological epistles, and several other Protestants, convinced therof by the current of primitive antiquity.

That the Christian Liturgy was in ancient times ever celebrated in Greek, Chaldee, Latin or other language unknown to vulgar Christians, and in a part of the Church where lay people might not approach, and great part of it secretly, and out of the hearing of any body, and with much pomp of vestments, gold and silver chalices, &c. is amply testified by Theodore Beza, in his eight epistle theological. And therfor Queen Elizabeth did not think she acted against antiquity, when she caused the Service to be read in English all over Wales, where the people understand it not. For which very same reason the great Cardinal Richlieu deservedly taxed heretical ministers (who ex-  
cept



cept, at least in outward show, against this ancient custom) for their practising the very same thing, (as convinced in their own consciences that it was the ancient practice) both in *Bearn*, *Narbo*, *Province*, and other places, where the ministers of those places read Service in the French Tongue, which was not the language of those Provinces, nor by any of those people any more understood, than is Latin by the vulgar of mankind. And yet the case is far otherwise in this affair amongst Catholiks than other people. For these do but only come together to hear and attend to the Minister what he sayes. But the Priests in the Catholik Church comes to make atonement for the people: which may well be done, so long as the said people are in a general disposition of heart fitly disposed to present themselves before the face of their Lord for that end, whether they hear and know the sighs and requests of their petitioner in particular for them or no, so long as they are assured they are of that true Church, by whom their priests are directed in their duty. For thus it was in the law of Moyses dictated by God himself. *There shall be no man*, saith the sacred text, *Lev. 16. in the tabernacle of the congregation, when the priest goeth in to make an atonment in the holy place, untill he come out and have made an atonement for himself and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.* If God allowed  
of

of this custom four thousand years ago, it can neither be a novelty nor ill.

As for images and their due respect, the Magdeburgian Centuriators in their 4. Century testify, That *Lactantius* affirms many superstitious things concerning the efficacy of Christs image. And in their 8. century, That *S. Bede* erred in the worshipping of images. So *Bale* in his pageant of Popes sayes, That *Gregory* by his indulgences established pilgrimages to images, and defended worshipping of images. As also, That *S. Leo* allowed the worshipping of Images. *Functius* another Protestant in his chronology at 494. addes, That *Xenaias* who lived thirteen hundred years ago, was specially noted and condemned for being the first that stirred up wars against images. This is then no novelty neither.

As for Purgatory and prayer for the dead, *Fulk* in his *Retentive* affirms, That it prevailed within three hundred years after Christ. And in his confutation of Purgatory, That *Ambrose* allowed prayer for the dead, and that it was the common error of his time. And again in the same book, That *Chrysostom* and *Jerom* allowed prayer for the dead: and in another place of the same book, That *Austin* blindly defended it: and again there, That *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Austin*, *Jerom*, and many others affirm, that sacrifice for the dead is the tradition of the Apostles. As also he had acknowledged about ten pages before, in the same book,

book, That prayers for the dead is taught in the writings now extant under the name of Dionysius Areopagita, mentioned in the acts of the Apostles, which book, though he doubt whether it be his or no, yet himself writing against the Rhemish upon the 2. Thessalonians, allows it to have been written above thirteen hundred years ago. Chemnitius in his Examen sayes, That it was taught by Austin, Epiphanius, and Chrysostom: as nine pages before that, he had said, It was taught by Origen, Ambrose, Prudentius and Jerom. Mr. George Gifford in his Demonstration sayes, That it was generally in the Church long before Austin, as may be seen in Cyprian and Tertullian. And Bucer in his Enarrations upon the Gospels speaks, That prayer and alms were made for the dead almost from the very beginning of the Church. This is not a novelty then.

As for Papal Superiority, the Protestant Centuriators acknowledg, That in the first age of the Church, above a thousand years ago, the Roman Byskops applyed themselves to establish dominion over other Churches; and, That they usurped to themselves right of granting priviledges and ornaments to other Archbyskops: and, That they confirmed Archbyskops in their Sees: and, That they deposed and excommunicated some, and absolved others: That they arrogated power to themselves of citing other Archbyskops to declare their caus before them: That against a byshop appealing to the

Apo-

*Apostolick See, nothing should be determined, but what the byshop of Rome censured ; That they appointed their legates in remote Provinces, challenging authority to hear and determin all uprising controversies ; especially, in questions of faith : That they took upon them power of appointing general councils, and to preside therein, either by themselves or their deputies, rejecting for unlawful those Synods that were called without their authority. They also adde in the same century, That Roman Byshops had flatterers in those times, who affirmed, that without permission of the Roman byshop none might undertake the person of a judge. Nay, forgetting themselves they averre in the same century, Collat. 773. That antiquity had attributed the principality of Priesthood to the Roman byshop above all. I could alledg also the like confession of Beza, Mr. Whitgift, and Cartwright : but those eminent Protestant Centuriators may serv for all, who testifie further in that fifth century, That Victor called the Roman Church the head of all Churches: That Turbius Asturiensis flattered Pope Leo, and acknowledged his superiority : That sometimes byshops condemned in Synods appealed to the See of Rome, as did, say they, Flavianus Patriarch of Constantinople in the Council of Epheſus ; and that Councils also requested to have their acts confirmed by the byshop of Rome. And so indeed did not only Flavianus appeal to Pope Leo, but Talida Patriarch of Alex-*

Alexandria deposed by the Emperour Zeno, appealed also to Pope Simplicius; S. Athanasius to Pope Julius; &c. So did the Council of Chalcedon request to be confirmed by Pope Leo, the Council of Carthage by Pope Innocent, the Council of Ephesus by Pope Celestin, &c.

The like superiority of the Roman byshop, not only over the neighbour Churches and Byshops of Italy, but over remote provinces, and the greatest Archbishops and Patriarks of the world is acknowledged by Protestants to have been practised also before that, in the fourth age, when the Church first lift up her head by favour of Constantine the great; and appeared openly in the world. In this age say the Centuriators, *the mystery of iniquity was not idle*. And they say also, that then *the byshop of Rome challenged by ecclesiastical canon, the disallowing of those Synods whereat they were absent*; That Theodoret a greek father, who lived about the latter end of this age, *deposed by the Council of Ephesus, was restored to his byshoprick by Pope Leo, unto whom he had made his appeal*; and that S. Chrysostom appealed likewise to Pope Innocentius; who thereupon decreed his adversary Theophilus to be excommunicated and deposed: That the famous and ancient Council of Sardis, consisting of above 300. byshops assembled from Spain, France, Italy, Sardinia, Greece, Egypt, The-

bais, Lybia, Palestin, Arabia, and sundry other places of the world, and wherat sundry fathers of the Nicen Council were present, *decreed appeals to the byshop of Rome* : for which fact the *Centurians blame the said council* ; as do also Osiander, Calvin, Peter Martyr and others. And lastly, that wheras the Arrians had expelled Athanasius byshop of Alexandria, Paulus byshop of Constantinople, and other Catholick byshops of the East, and brought their accusation to Julius then byshop of Rome, that he might ratifie what they had done, he, the said byshop *summoned Athanasius according to the canons, and when he had heard all sides speak, he restored Athanasius and his fellow byshops to their own place ; fretus ecclesie Romana prerogativa*, as the Centurists there speak.

In the age before this, when raging persecution obscured both the government and most of the written monuments of that time, yet want there not monuments of the Popes power in confirming, deposing, restoring byshops. Then it was, that S. Cyprian, as himself testifies, moved Pope Stephen, by his letters to depose Martinianus from his byshoprick, and appoint another in his place ; and he tells us likewise in his fourth epistle, how Basilides went to Rome, hoping to beguile Pope Stephen then ignorant of the whole matter, so to procure himself to be restored to his byshoprick, from which he had

had been justly, saith S. Cyprian, deposed. In this age the foresaid learned Centuriators reprove Pope Stephen for his undertaking to threaten excommunication to Helenus and Firmiltanus, and all others throughout Cilicia, Cappadocia, and Asia for rebaptizing hereticks; they reprove also, as became Protestants to do, both S. Cyprian and Tertullian in this point; Tertullian for saying, that the keyes were committed to S. Peter, and the Church built on him; S. Cyprian, for affirming the Church to be built upon S. Peter, and one chair founded by our Lords voice upon the rock; for calling Peters chair the principal Church, from whence Priestly unity ariseth: and for saying, that there ought to be one byshop in the Catholik Church; and that the Roman Church ought to be acknowledged of all other for the mother and root of the Catholik Church.

In the second age, the next after the apostles, wherof fewer monuments remain, yet be there some testimonies of this superiority acknowledged even by Protestants. Pope Victor is owned even by our Mr. Whitgift in his defence, to be a godly byshop and martyr, and the Church in his time in great purity, not being long after the apostles times; and yet Amandus Polonus a Protestant Professour at Basil sayes in his theological thesis of the same Pope Victor, That he shewed a Papal mind and arrogancy: and Mr. Spark in his answer against John Albines, thinks him,



somewhat Pope-like to have exceeded his bounds, when he took upon him to excommunicate the bishops of the East: and Whitaker charges him with exercising jurisdiction upon other Churches. So that these three Protestants discerned a papal power even in this second pure age of the Church, although they liked it not. But the Protestant Centuriators do much except against a saying of S. Irenæus, who lived in this age next after the apostles, and might well remember the apostles own lively preachings, (as Hamelmannus a Protestant writer in his book of traditions, speaks both of Irenæus and Polycarp) recorded in the third chapter of his third book, *Ad hanc enim ecclesiam Romanam, propter potentiores principalem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam*; It is necessary, that every other Church, saith Irenæus, comply with the Roman, by reason of her greater principality. First, because he sayes it is necessary; secondly, that every Church; thirdly, for the Roman Church's more potent principality, to comply with her, the Centurists are much displeased at it, and censure it for a very corrupt speech. And indeed the papal power and jurisdiction was so eminent in all ages, that Philip Nicolai in his comment *de regno Christi*, refers the beginning of it to the infirmity of the Apostles, and bishops succeeding them. For there speaking of the origin and increase of papal power, *Primatus affectatio*, saith he,

he, *communis fuit infirmitas apostolorum, ac etiam primorum urbis episcoporum.*

Finally, in the first age, that St. Peter had a primacy above the other apostles, is acknowledged by Calvin; *The twelve apostles had one among them to govern the rest*; by Musculus, *The celestial spirits are not equal, the apostles themselves were not equal, Peter is found in many places to have been chief amongst the rest, which we deny not*; by Mr. Whitgift, *Amongst the Apostles themselves ther was one chief*; and by Dr. Covell, who in his examinations, teaches at large against the Puritans, both that *there was one appointed over the rest amongst the apostles to keep them in unity*; and that *that government was not to ceas with the apostles, but ever to continue in the Church*; and that it is the only way to prevent dissention, and suppress heresies; and that otherwise the Church would be in a far wors case, than the meanest Commonwealth, nay almost than a den of thieves. But the Centurists like not this; and therfor do they in their 4. Cent. reprehend many of the Fathers, for entituling Peter *the head of the apostles, and the byshop of byshops*. So indeed Optatus calls him *apostolorum caput*, and therfor *Cephas*; Origen *apostolorum principem*; Cyril of Jerusalem, *principem & caput caterorum*; Cyril of Alexandria, *Pastorem & caput ecclesie*; Arnobius *Episcoporum episcopum*; the Council of Chalcedon, *Petram & verticem ecclesie Catho-*

*lice.* Thus much for that point ; which by all this is proved to be far from any novelty.

As for Saints invocation, and the antiquity of that beleef and custom, it is acknowledged by the Centurists, Chemnitius, our Dr. Whitgift, and Fulk. Dr. Whitgift in his defence hath these words, *Almost all the byshops and writers of the Greek Church and Latin also, for the most part were spotted with doctrins of Free-will, of merit, of invocation of Saints, and such like.* Fulk in his rejoynder to Bristow, *I confesse, saith he, that Ambrose, Austin, and Jerom held invocation of Saints to be lawful :* and in his book against the Rhemish Testament, *In Nazianzen, Basil, and Chrysostom I confesse, saith he, is mention of invocation of Saints: and again, that Theodoret also speaketh of prayers to martyrs: and again in the same book; that Leo ascribeth much to the prayers of S. Peter for him: and again, that many ancient fathers held, that Saints departed pray for us.* Chemnitius in his examen, acknowledges as much of *S. Basil, Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen, Theodoret, S. Jerom, and even S. Austin himself.* The Centurists charge the same upon *S. Cyprian*, who is ancients than *S. Austin*; and again upon *Origen*, who was ancients than *Cyprian*: adding, that there are manifest steps of Saints invocation in the doctors of that ancient age. So, this is no novelty then.

Lastly, as for the Sacrifice of Mass, and  
Altars,

Altars, (which as Dr. Reynolds sayes well in his conference with Hart, are linked together) Peter Martyr in his common places, *reproveth Peter of Alexandria for attributing more, as he speaks, to the outward altar, than to the living temples of Christ*: and he checks Optatus also for saying, *what is the altar? even the seat of the body and blood of Christ*; such sayings as these, saith Peter Martyr, *edified not the people*; and lastly, *all the fathers in general he finds fault with, for their abusing so frequently the name Altar*; which indeed is spoken of even by S. Ignatius, the Apostles undoubted schollar, *who is therfor carped at by Cartwright*. Calvin, Fulk, and Field acknowledg, *that most ancient fathers, S. Athanasius, Ambrose, Austin, Arnobius, talked much of the Christian Sacrifice and Altar, and Priests, who offer and pour out daily on the holy table*; adding, *that the fathers without doubt received that their doctrin from the Jews and Gentiles whom therein they imitated*. The Centuriators in 3. Cent. blame Cyprian as *superstitious in that point*; and in their 2 Cent. say, *that S. Irenæus and Ignatius though disciples of the apostles, were dangerously erroneous in that account*. Sebastianus Francus in his epistle *de abrogandis in universum omnibus statutis ecclesiasticis* affirms, *that presently after the apostles times, the supper of our Lord was turned into a sacrifice*. Andreas Chraftovius in his book *de opificio missæ*, charges the most ancient fathers with using a propitiatory

*sacrifice.* And our own Ascham in his *Apologēt. pro cœna Domini*, is found to acknowledg, that *sacrifice for the dead and living is so ancient in the Christian Church, that no beginning of it can be found:* although he thinks also with Calvin, that it was derived, whensoever it first began, from the custom either of the Jews or Gentiles, or both; thus bespattering with his rash pen the very first sproutings of Christianity in the world. However it is in the mean time no novelty at least.

And let any one in any age of Christianity look all over the Christian world, on any of those who profess that name, whether they kept communion with the Roman Church, or brake by schisme from it; or perhaps never heard of it, as they say the Church in Ethiopia did not, and he shall find that they all had this Christian sacrifice amongst them, as the great capital work of their Religion. The *Grecians* under their Patriarch of Constantinople even still after their schisme have their Priests celebrating in all their ancient robes this their sacred liturgy to this day in the learned greek tongue all over the world where they live, and may serv God, not only in Greece, Epirus, Macedon and islands of the Egæan sea, but in many parts of *Natolia*, *Circassia*, *Russia*, *Thrace*, *Bulgaria*, *Rascia*, *Servia*, *Bosnia*, *Walachia*, *Moldavia*, *Dalmatia*, *Croatia*, *Thracia*, and up as far North as *Trebisond*.

bisond. The *Assyrians* or *Melchites*, who are under the Archbyshop of Damascus, whom they intitle Patriarch of Antioch: The *Georgians* that dwell between the Euxin and Caspian seas, under their Metropolitan who resides in the monastery of S. Catherin in Mount Sinai. The *Circassians* that live between them and the river Tanais: The *Muscovites* or *Russians*, under the primate of Mosco: The *Nestorians* dispersed up and down in Assyria, Mesopotamia, Parthia, Media even to Cataia and India, under their Patriarch residing either in Muzal, or the monastery of S. Ermes fast by it. The *Indians* or *Christians of S. Thomas*, about the cities of Coulan and Maliapar, Angamal and Cochin under their own archbyshop, who is subject to the patriark of Muzal, or patriark of Babylon, as they call him: The *Jacobites* in Cyprus, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Palestin, under their patriark resident in Caramit metropolis of Mesopotamia, or els in the monastery of S. Saphran near the city Merdin: The *Cophiti*, or Christians of Egypt, subject to the patriark of Alexandria: The *Habassins* or midland Ethiopians under their own patriark or *Abuna*, who is ever a monk of S. Antonies order, consecrated for them by the patriark of Alexandria: The *Armenians*, on this side and beyond Euphrates, under their two patriarks, resident, one of them in Mitilene, or els in the city of Sis, nor

far from Tarsus in Cilicia, the other in Sebastia, or els in the monastery of Ecmeazin: The *Maronites* resident in mount Libanus, under their patriarch, who is ever a monk, and resides either in Tripoli, or in the great monastery of S. Antony: All these, although many of them fell away long since from ecclesiastick unity upon their dislike of the Council of Ephesus and Chalcedon, where one person and two natures in Christ was declared, and others of them upon other such like occasion, yet do they still keep up all of them, their monasteries, altars, priesthood, sacred ordination, messach, and ancient Christian Liturgy. Nor do they know any other way of serving or appeasing the Almighty in order to heavenly bliss, than this propitiatory sacrifice, which received from their forefathers they practise and exercise to this day. And this was ever the great devotion of all Christians, and still is, excepting only some few here in the North who have gone out of that primitive Christianity, the last age, by following the unhappy steps of Luther and Calvin; and not all of them neither. For Luther, although he fouled, yet did he not throw down the altar: and the pure Lutherans that be yet in Germany, Denmark and Sweathland, keep it up still.

Thus Sir have other Protestants admitted all that to be ancient, which this your Disswader  
calls



calls a novelty unheard of in ancient times. Nay Luther and Calvin esteemed all Popery an old Egyptian darknes spread over the face of the Church all ages since the Apostles dayes, and dissipated at length by that new light which they revealed. It is a strange thing that Popery which in Luther and Calvins dayes was old, should now after a hundred years be grown young again. But when Protestancy was new, then Popery was old ; and now Popery must be thought new, when Protestancy is grown old and rotten. Truth is, it was the Ministers advantage, to acknowledg Popery to be old, when where Catholik Religion spread all over the earth, had all her monuments intire by her, to shew her antiquity to all people then living ; who had also heard of the Catholik faith of their ancestours ; although they made it by flight of fallacious oratory erroneous. But here and now in England, where all those monuments are destroyed, it is a double convenience to say, that Popery is erroneous and new too. When the first Reformers endeavoured to supplant the Catholik professours of their means and livings, it was best to accuse them of old errors. But now to keep their livings they have invaded, it is a wiser part it seems, to inveigh against Popery as a novelty. There novelty could no way be proved ; and here in England antiquity cannot easily be shown.

Then

Then matter of fact would have disproved novelty; now matter of fact will not prove antiquity here in this Kingdom, where the ancient religion is abrogated about a hundred years ago; and people now alive that behold Protestantcy, never saw Catholick Religion, and are almost perswaded by their ministers there was never any such thing here. Nor will people read Catholick authors, nor beleev them if they do; nor have they power to consider who built all their Churches, or made their laws, or any other good thing done for them by Catholick beleivers, but take all Papists to be in a manner Atheists, becaus they com not to hear their ministers talk in those Churches from whence poor Catholiks were first solemnly banisht; and then within a while after were punished for not coming there; at such a time, when their altar, sacrifice and priesthood were now abolished, and their priests put to death, and others made liable to it afterwards, when ever they should come into those Churches again to do their functions; and ministers had got into their places to rail against them and that holy ancient Religion, which had built those Churches to their hands.

Ther is I think no better way imaginable to discover the natur of the ancient Christian Church, than by considering what was said to be her beleeif and practice then, when first she dared

dared to show her face openly in the world, appearing at length as it were from under ground and her former lurking condition, wherein she had remained three hundred years under the cruel persecution of Pagan Emperours. As soon as Constantin the Great, Gods heavenly grace so moving him, had first taken this holy Church by the hand, and cloathed her with her ornaments of peace, then surely she would appear her self. And what she was then, may be easily gathered by such ancient writers, who either purposely spake of the life of Constantin, or incidentally of the things which were done in those dayes, as Eusebius, Zozomen, S. Jerom, Bede, and others; who deliver us the form and features of the Christian Church in those times, so like unto the Popery that is now adayes, after thirteen or fourteen hundred years, both in the particulars Dr. Taylor speaks of, and several others now cancelled by our Protestant Reformation; that a man may safely swear, that the now present Popery and old Christianity are one and the same thing.

Eusebius tells us, how Constantin the Emperour after the fashion of those good times, chastised his own body with fasting and disciplines; how he used to bless himself, and sign his face with the sign of the Cross; how highly he honoured and set up that triumphal ensign,

sign, having confidence of victory in vertue therof; how he erected illustrious temples in memory of the Christian martyrs; how he refused to sit down in the general Council of Nice, till the Prelates there had given their consent; how he dedicated a sumptuous Church in memory of the apostles, and provided there a sepulchre for himself, to the end that after his death he might be partaker of the prayers there offered; how he assembled the priests to the dedication of his temple, wherot some preached, others offered sacrifice for the common peace, for the Church of God, and for the Emperour; and lastly how in his sickness he confest his sins in a chappel of the martyrs, and prayer and sacrifice made for his soul after his deceas.

Zozomen in his history tells us also of him, that becaus those primitive Christians used consecrated places, and only them for their publick Liturgy, Constantin had ever carried with him in the camp a portable altar and tabernacle, and priests and deacons attending it, for celebration of divine mysteries; how much also he honoured the holy monk S. Anthony for the great austerities of his life; how he would have all conciliar decisions to be regarded as most firm and unalterable; and that he would not undertake the judgment of ecclesiastical causes; and that he had great veneration for  
the

the sign of the Cross. These and such like things speaks Zozomen.

So likewis, that Churches and Altars were consecrated in the time of Constantin the Great, with the sign of the Cross and sprinkling of holy water amongst other Catholik rites and ceremonies, is witnessed by S. Austin and S. Bede. That Constantin the Emperour translated to Constantinople the holy reliques of S. Andrew, S. Luke, and S. Timothy, at which the devils even audibly yelled and roared out, is asserted by S. Jerom. That the Emperour in all his glory went to kiss the Martyrs Sepulchres, humbly praying those Saints, that they would be intercessours to God for him, is told us by S. Chrysostom. And lastly, that in Constantins dayes the Popes authority was acknowledged and revered, is apparent by the great Synod of Arles then celebrated, who decreeing that Easter should be uniformly kept, intreated Pope Sylvester, to direct his letters according to the Churches custom all the world over for that end.

Nay, the Century writers of Magdeburg, enemies of the Catholik Church, and so renowned Protestants, that they have been stiled by their followers, *Men worthy of eternal memory*, even these do write of Constantin, (though with a design to diminish his honour) that he appointed a great holiday for the temples

ples dedication, which we in English call a *Wake*: that he favoured consecrations and superstitious exornations of Churches; that he with other Christians in those times met for Gods service only in consecrated places: that he would have candles to burn in Churches in the day time; that superstitiously he sent to Constantinople some reliques of the Cross found by his mother Helena, for the preservation of the City; that in Constantins time pilgrimages were much in use, and that his mother Helena went to the holy land to worship: that Priests were forbid to marry by the Synod of Arles, in the time of Emperour Constantin and Pope Sylvester: that both under Constantin and long before his time were both Monks and Nuns spread all over Asia, Syria, Palestin, Ægypt, Bithynia, &c. that Constantin did so reverence Bishops, that he would not sit amongst them in the Nicen Council, but in a lower seat: That the said Emperour checked Akefius for denying Priests to have power of forgiving sins, bidding him set up a ladder for himself, and go up to heaven his own way all alone: and lastly, that after his death they poured out tears and prayes every where for the Emperours soul.

And other Protestant writers many of them since, as Napper for example in an English treatise upon the Revelations, and Frigivillæus  
in

in a latin one called *Palma Christiana*, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, convinced by so palpable testimonies every where obvious, acknowledge the Christian Church in Constantins time to have been wholly Papistical. After the year of God three hundred, saith Napper, the Emperour Constantin subjugated all Christian Churches to Pope Sylvester, from which time till these our dayes the Pope and his Clergy have possessed the outward visible Church. And Frigivilæus in his wrath calls therupon the noble Emperour Constantin, the great Dragon who gave power to the Beast. Take it all in their own words.

Thus Eusebius; *Ab omni licentiâ & vitæ luxu diffuente sese vocavit, inediâ & corporis afflictione seipsum coercuit imperator, l. 2. de vitâ Constantini, c. 14. Atq; interdum vultum salutarî illâ signavit notâ, l. 3. c. 2. Imperator triumphale signum honoravit: and again, In qua parte istud crucis vexillum visum fuit, hostes fugam capere, victores persequi. Quâ re intellectâ imperator sicubi partem aliquam sui exercitus languentem cernebat, ibi salutare illud vexillum tanquam quoddam subsidium ad victoriam obtinendam locari mandavit; cujus adjumentis extemplo parata est victoria: quippe dimicantium vires divina quadam potentiâ fuere admodum confirmata, l. 2. c. 7. Civitatem multis templis in honorem martyrum illustrißimisq; adibus sacris adornavit, l. 3. c. 47.*



Cum parva quadam sella ex auro fabricata illi esset loco posita, non prius confedit quam episcopi ad id annuissent, l. 3. c. 10. Apostolorum templum ad perpetuam illorum memoriam conservandam edificare cepit, l. 4. c. 58. In opportunum ventura mortis diem hic locum sibi provida dispensatione designavit, ut defunctus quoque precationum, quae ibidem essent ad apostolorum gloriam offerendae, particeps efficeretur, l. 4. c. 60. Sacerdotes alii qui horum nihil poterant efficere, incruentis consecrationibus divinum numen placabant, & supplices Deo preces offerebant pro communi pace, pro ecclesia Dei, ipsoque imperatore, l. 4. c. 45. Humi procumbens genibus in ipsa martyrum ade errata sua confessus est, &c. Adhuc quidem licet contemplari ter beata anima tumulum divinis ceremoniis & mystico sacrificio sanctarumque precationum societate perfrui, l. 4. c. 61. 71.

Thus Zozomen; Tabernaculum ecclesiae figuram exprimens, cum contra hostes praelio contenderet, secum circumferre consuevit imperator. Constantinus ad eum finem, uti neque sibi in solitudine agenti neque exercitui deesset ades sacra, &c. Sacerdotes & diaconi tabernaculum assidue secuti sunt, l. 1. c. 8. Antonium magum illum monachum in solitudinibus Aegypti magnam cum nominis & fame celebritate vitam degentem Constantinus imperator propter ejus virtutis splendorem sibi amicum fecit, literas honorifice scriptas ad eum misit, l. 1. c. 13. Jussit Constantinus, ut Concilio-

rum

rum decisiones firmæ & immutabiles existerent, l. 1. c. 9. Mihi verò non est fas, cùm homo sim, ejusmodi causarum cognitionem arrogare, l. 1. c. 16. Sancta crux plurimum tribuit honoris, tum propter subsidia in bello contra hostes gerendo ex ejus virtute sibi allata, tum propter divinam sibi de eâ oblatam visionem, l. 1. c. 8.

Thus the other Fathers; Crucis charactere basilica dedicantur, altaria consecrantur, Aug. serm. 19. de sanctis. Bed. l. 1. c. 30. l. 5. c. 4. Constantinus imperator sanctas reliquias Andrea, Luca, & Timothei transtulit Constantinopolin, ad quas demones rugiunt, Hieron. contra Vig. Nam & ipse qui purpuram indutus est, accedit illa amplexus sepulchra, & fastu deposito stat sanctis supplicaturus, ut pro se ad Deum intercedat, Chrys. hom. 26. in ep. 2. Cor. De observatione Paschæ Domini constitutum est in hac Synodo, ut uno die & tempore per omnem orbem observetur: & juxta consuetudinem, literas ad omnes Papa Sylvester tu dirigas, Conc. 1. Arelatense, can. 1.

Thus the Century writers, Constantinus diem festum admodum solennem ad celebrandam dedicationem templi indixit, Cent. 4. coll. 452. Templorum recens extructorum consecrationes, exornationes superbas aliaque superstitiosa, quorum maximam partem Constantinus excogitavit, & in multis ecclesias propagavit, coll. 497. Christianos in templis nondum consecratis non convenisse clare indicat Athanasius, coll. 408. Accensione candela-

larum interdictum in templis Constantinus instituit, coll. 497. Plane simili superstitione Constantinus reliquias quasdam de cruce ab Helena reperit à Constantinopolinim dicitur transtulisse, ut esset ejus urbis conservatrix, coll. 1529. Caperunt hoc saculo primum sub Constantino loca terra sancta, &c. in pretio haberi, &c. Helena mater imperatoris mulier superstitiosa illuc profecta est adorandi causa, coll. 457. Secunda Synodus celebrata est Constantini imperatoris & Sylvestri tempore, &c. ubi can. 2. dicitur. Assumi aliquem ad sacerdotium, in vinculo conjugii constitutum, nisi fuerit promissa conversio, non oportet, coll. 704. Fuisse etiam ante Constantinum virgines seu mulieres continentes & castitatem perpetuam professas ex libro quarto Eusebii de vita Constantini apparet; ubi magnopere approbasse disciplinam ejusmodi imperatorem Constantinum affirmat; adeo ut frequenter eorum contubernium adierit. Helenam vero Constantini matrem Hierosolymis virgines Deo sacras reperisse Socrates testatur, quarum professionem usque adeo probavit, ut ministram illis sese prabuerit, coll. 467. Monachi per Syriam, Palestinam, Bythiniam, & reliqua Asia loca sub Constantino magno, coll. 1294. Notum est quam reverentiam & observantiam episcopis habuerit Constantinus in Synodo Nicæna; ubi nec confedere prius quam episcopi annuissent, voluit, coll. 460. Ad pœnitentiam admoneri homines, spem verò remissionis non à sacerdotibus sed ab ipso Deo expectare, &c. Cùm hæc dixisset

dixisset Acesius, subjunxit imperator, *Pone scalam  
 ô Acesi, & solus ascende in cælum*, coll. 653. *Tur-  
 ba frequens preces cum fletu pro animâ imperatoris  
 fudit*, coll. 454.

Thus Frigivillæus Gauvius, *Constantinus tri-  
 buit Romano episcopo primatum ante omnes*. And  
 again, *Ex eo apparet fatale fuisse, ut Constanti-  
 nus daret potestatem bestia, quâ statim Julius  
 exercuit*. Nam etiam Constantinus magnus fere-  
 bat arma draconis in insignis suis, &c. ita ut ipse  
 sit draco, qui dedit potestatem bestia, & typus dra-  
 conis serpentis antiqui, Apoc. 13. *qui bestia po-  
 testatem dedit*. These words are in his Palma,  
 P. 34.

And the same Centurists, learned and indu-  
 strious Protestants, do manifestly acknowledg,  
 although they also dislike it, even in that fourth  
 age above thirteen hundred years ago; when the  
 Christian Church first lift up her head in the  
 world, all in a manner practices, beleef and  
 rites yet held in the Roman Church, and utter-  
 ly now abolisht by the Protestant reformation,  
 as then in vogue amongst the prelates and peo-  
 ple of those times: for example, the Primacy of  
 the bishop of Rome deduced by divine right from  
 that of S. Peter, coll. 515. 551. 556. 458. the  
 single life of Priests, 616. 486. the sumptuousnes  
 of consecrating Churches and celebrating Masses in  
 hallowed places, 497. the rites used in ordination of  
 deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers,

door-keepers, and in the unction and consecration of Priests, 873 & 874. 435. ecclesiastical vestments, the alb, the stole, Dalmatick, cope, mytre, 504. 876. 835. saying of prayers upon little stones or beads, coll. 1329. worshipping and estimation of the Cross, 302. praying towards the East, 432. canonical hours, 433. mattins in the night, 459. solemn funeral rites and prayer for the souls of the deceased, 453. 454. 455. Priests blessing of the bride and bridegroom after marriage, 453. prohibition of marriage as well as eating of flesh in Lent, 453. 441. consecration of monks and monasteries, 466. vowed chastity, poverty and abstinence, anchorets, hermits, their cells and austerity of life, 470. 488. 300, 301. 471. 474. Images in the Church, and candles there burning in the day time, 409, 410. solemn translation of Saints relicks, and placing them under the altar, with pilgrimages to them, wherat sick persons were miraculously cured, 456, 457. 602. consecration of baptismal water, and confirmation by a byssop with chrysm, 415. 420. 865. sign of the cross in baptisme and exorcismes, 421. 417. Free-will, interiour justification and merit of good works, 291, 292, 293. confession of sins to a priest, pennance and absolution with imposition of hands, 425. 834. unwritten traditions, 299. invocation of Saints, 295. Purgatory, 304. altars consecrated with the sign of the cross and chrysm, called the seat of Christs body and blood, 409. real presence

sence and transubstantiation, 209. 985. the reservation of that sacrament, and offering it up a sacrifice to God propitiatory both for the living and dead, 427. 430. 985. chalice, coverings and holy vessels which lay people might not touch, 490. 835. mixtur of water with wine in the chalice, in time of consecration, 480. In a word; all things which the Roman Catholik Church now beleevs and praetises contrary to themselves are acknowledged by those learned Protestants in that fourth age to be so spread over the face of Christianity, that many others of the same beleeif with them have not feared to say, that the Church in those dayes, when she first lift up her head in the world, was Antichristian and Papistical. Popery then is no such novelty, as Dr. Taylor imagines, or would have us at least imagine it to be.

## The Disswatives second Chapter.

*That the Church of Rome uses doctrines and practices that are directly or by consequent impious, and give warrant to a wicked life.*

**I**S declared in 12. Sections. For the Roman doctrine teaches, saith he, that a sinner is not bound presently to repent, and that contrition is of it self of no value, Sect. 1. Teaches also, a confession that is frivolous, and either of

“ ill or no consequence, sect. 2. Teaches a pen-  
 “ nance that is ineffectiue, sect. 3. Teaches In-  
 “ dulgences of no use, sect. 4. Teaches other  
 “ assertions attending hereon both fals and  
 “ wicked; as that a habit of sin is no sin, and  
 “ that one sin is venial, another mortal, sect. 5.  
 “ Teaches, that a probable opinion may safely  
 “ be followed, sect. 6. Teaches fond battolo-  
 “ gies and prayers without attention, sect. 7.  
 “ Teaches prayer to dead men, sect. 8. Teach-  
 “ es fond and wicked exoriscations and incanta-  
 “ tions, sect. 9. Teaches new Sacraments with-  
 “ out warrant, sect. 10. Teaches image-wor-  
 “ ship against good life and vertue, sect. 11.  
 “ Lastly, teaches the abuse of faith, hope, and  
 “ charity. And so is demonstrated your Dis-  
 swaders second plea against Papists. But to an-  
 swer all this in a word, The Roman Church or  
 Catholik faith teaches none of this.

### His third Chapter.

*That the Roman Church teaches doctrines destructive of Christian society, and monarchy.*

“ **I**S shown in three sections. First, she teach-  
 “ es it is lawful to lye and speak falsities.  
 “ Secondly, she does intollerable prejudice to  
 “ government by exemption of Clergy. Third-  
 “ ly, subjects Princes to the Pope, and sepa-  
 rateth



“rateth wives from husbands, and children  
“from parents. And thus he concludes his  
“third plea against Popery, ending his book  
“with a prayer, *That the Lord would give his*  
“*reader understanding.*

He prayes to his own ruin. For if the reader of his book have understanding, the writer of it will utterly lose his credit. And is it possible, that Dr. Taylor should have so low opinion of us all, as to expose such talk as this to the view of three nations? He wrote indeed first and principally for those Irish people that belong to his charge; and he has it may be some such opinion of them, as I remember I had, when being a boy I first heard talk of the wild Irish. But we are now men, and should put away such childish things. Neither they nor we, are so wild or simple, as Dr. Taylor — takes us to be.

How he has behaved himself in his first chapter, wherein he would prove Popery, that is to say, Catholik Religion neither apostolik nor primitive, I have told you Sir more at large. Now I tell you briefly, concerning these two chapters, that ther is not so much as any the least parcel of popery proposed to be confuted therin. But he either depraves and slanders their religion; or imposes, what no way belongs to it; which is injustice on both hands. But their discredit will promote his applaus; and

and he cares not how it be effected. He is secure, if they be misunderstood, and himself beleev'd to be their enemy. For then, the better part of the land will hold him up, and the other not go about to pull him down. And therfor that all may joyn with him in the derision of this same *Ecce homo*, he first like a Jew puts a reed into the Papists hand, and then laughs at the featous scepter.

All this whole book of Dr. Taylors, and three parts of all the other books that have ever been written since the Reformation against Popery, might be sufficiently answered, without descending to particulars, and totally annulled by one general discours of *the nature and properties of school-divinity*, whence the adversaries of Catholik faith cull out all their little drolleries, when they make their rhetorical discourses against Popery, to blind the Land, and abuse good people. And I had it in my heart, when I first set pen to paper, to do it fully; so much in my heart, that I made but little account in comparison of all the other things I had to speak. But I have already exceeded the length of a letter, and shall take some other time for that discours. Only take notice Sir, that Dr. Taylor, and such like Protestant writers do as fond and unjustly herein, as that Catholik would do, who undertaking to write against protestancy, should never take  
notice

notice either of the principles of reformation, or of the articles, canons, or constitutions, for example, of our English Church, but only pick out here and there some few words of this or that obscure ministers book, found up and down in the Stationers shops in Oxford, Cambridge, or London, and call a heap of such stuff, swerving perhaps from the Protestantcy he opposes, by the name of *Protestant-doctrin*. Thus do all Protestants deal with popery. Not a word do we hear when any one of them writes against it, of their substantial Religion, which is in the hearts and hands of all Catholiks, established by gospel, tradition, and councils, and justified by the universal practice and judgments of all men in the world who profess that faith, which only is popery and Catholik profession; but only some deviations either in the words or manners of some one or other that have lived amongst them: and this is that they call *Popery*.

This Disswative of Dr. Taylors is wholly nothing els: only with this difference, that the subject and heads of his first chapter is something that pertains to Catholik faith and profession, though in speaking of them he utterly swerves from the purpos: but in his other two chapters, both what he speaks and what he speaks of, is utterly impertinent. But thus is malice and misapprehension against Catholiks  
and

and their Religion most holy and innocent, diffused up and down in mens hearts, to the ruin of charity, and a right understanding in this Land.

But my Protestant Countrey men, those I beseech not to be too credulous. And my Catholik Countrey men I most fervently beg of them, still more and more to beleev and hope and trust in God, who in his good time will justifie his own religion, and all his poor servants that profess it. We must still remember in what a world we live, and be willing for our beloved Lord to suffer contumelies here, in all resignation and peace. He that can do this is a conquerour of himself, and lord of the world, a friend of Christ, and heir of heaven.

This is all, Sir, I either mean or need to speak at this time, concerning this Disswasive. Try all things, and hold what is right. Truth like the sun will soon appear to an open, unveiled and clear eye: but prejudice leads us blindfold unto ruin. Nor must you stay, Sir, till our good ministers tell you, that you and they are in an error. Though an Angel from heaven should convince them of it; yet can he not by any argument perswade them to leave a wife and five hundred pound a year for a poor humble and naked truth. It were in the mean time a thing I should think of much wisdom in them, not to write any books against Papists. For they

they do but lose by that publick slander, which comes to Catholik eyes, all that varnish of vain glory, which they procure themselves by private calumnies cast upon them in the pulpit, which Catholiks never hear of. Some one or other amongst those papists may haply think it expedient and no wayes against the rules of patience, to refute their folly. And then the minister is lost. That most honourable authority, which forbids Catholiks to write any books, forbids others by a tacit consequence, to slander them. For the law of God and nature ever permits, and sometimes commands, the innocent to justify themselves, and clear their injured reputation. Farewell.

Dated this 8. of the  
Calends of July,  
1665.

J. V. C.